

81 01922

---

---

# **SURPLUS LANDS STUDY**

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 13 1981

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

**JANUARY 1981**

---

---

## **Association of Bay Area Governments**

Hotel Claremont • Berkeley, California 94705 • (415) 841-9730


148



# SURPLUS LANDS STUDY

ISSUES SURROUNDING THE USE OF SURPLUS LAND  
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS  
FEBRUARY 1981



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124900609>



ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

FEBRUARY 1981

President, 1980-81:	Supervisor Susanne B. Wilson Santa Clara County
Vice President, 1980-81:	Rev. Ralph C. Bolin City of Napa
President, 1979-80:	Supervisor Rod J. Diridon Santa Clara County

PRINCIPAL AGENCY STAFF

Executive Director	Revan A. F. Tranter
Assistant Executive Director	Eugene Y. Leong
Director of Planning	Charles Q. Forester

PROJECT STAFF

Daniel B. Lopez, Housing Program Manager  
Jean Safir, Senior Regional Planner  
Jill Siegel Dodd, Regional Planner  
Paulette R. Anderson, Regional Planner  
Rodney Barger, Planning Intern/Project Coordinator  
Sally Germain, Administrative Secretary



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Policy Procedures for Selling Surplus Properties	3
III. The Importance of Community Interaction in the Affordable Housing Development Process	14
IV. The Need for Better Interagency Communication and Coordination	20
V. Role Models and Suggestions	24
VI. Summary	34
Appendix A. Surplus Land Survey Results	
Appendix B. Persons Interviewed	





## I. INTRODUCTION

This final report culminates ten months of work on the availability of surplus lands as a housing resource and the feasibility of using such lands for the development of low and moderate income housing. In May 1980, an inventory of surplus lands was undertaken (Appendix A) which resulted in the identification of approximately 2,656 acres of surplus publicly-owned lands in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. These surplus lands are owned by the State of California, school districts, cities, and counties. The properties located in this inventory were identified by use of a survey/questionnaire which was sent to all Bay Area counties, cities, school districts, and special districts. The surplus land information was obtained from the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

In compiling the information for the inventory of surplus lands, three major questions arose:

1. If the State of California, school districts, and local communities have so much surplus land, is it possible to utilize these lands for the purpose of developing affordable low and moderate income housing?
2. What are the present obstacles and opportunities to developing this surplus land as an affordable housing resource?
3. What types of procedures will make the process of utilizing these lands for affordable housing more feasible?

In order to address these questions in a knowledgeable fashion, it was decided that a wide variety of view points must be considered. For this reason, elected officials, school district officials, planners, builders, representatives from non-profit housing development corporations, state housing and transportation staff members, and community leaders were interviewed in order to obtain their views about the use of surplus lands for the development of low and moderate income housing. The basic intent of these interviews was to ascertain the issues surrounding the use of surplus lands for the development of low and moderate income housing and to determine how the decision-making process might be improved in order to address this critical housing need. The interview process focused on defining the major issues, suggesting possible solutions, and identifying possible implementation measures. This process allowed each interviewee the opportunity to express his/her opinion on the disposition of surplus properties. In addition,

because of the legal differences that exist in acquiring or disposing of different types of surplus lands (e.g., surplus school properties must be acquired/sold differently than surplus CalTrans lands), each of the interviewees tended to focus on the disposition of a particular kind of surplus property. A list of those interviewed is included as Appendix B.

In short, this report attempts to provide a perspective on the opportunities/obstacles associated with the use of surplus lands as a prime resource for the development of affordable housing for low and moderate income people. With that in mind, this report can be used by anyone who is involved in the development of low and moderate income housing. This includes for-profit and non-profit housing developers, community housing advocates, and people who work for public agencies. It is hoped that this conglomeration of opinions can aid in the expeditious selling and development of surplus properties. Furthermore, it is hoped that the readers of this report identify the tremendous need for all of the people involved in the housing process to work together. It is only through a broad based constituency that more affordable housing can be built.

Some final comments: The term "low income" is defined as an annual gross income that is less than 80 percent of the median Bay Area income. The term "moderate income" is defined as an annual gross income that ranges from 81 to 120 percent of the median Bay Area income. Currently in the Bay Area, a low income family of four earns up to \$18,700, while a moderate income family of four earns between \$18,701 to \$28,000. Finally, the term "affordable housing" is defined as housing which low and moderate income people can afford to rent or purchase.



## II. POLICY PROCEDURES FOR SELLING SURPLUS PROPERTIES

State agencies, local communities, and school districts who are owners of surplus properties must meet specific procedural guidelines in order to sell surplus properties. These guidelines have been established by the State of California for State and school district properties. Many local cities and counties have established their own procedures. This section focuses on the different procedures that school district, State agencies, and local communities must follow when a property has been defined as surplus and for sale. By elaborating on these procedures, the constraints and opportunities for low and moderate income housing development will begin to become apparent.

### School District Properties

Surplus school sites offer great potential for the development of housing. The location of these surplus sites is usually in an existing residential area with all utilities and urban services, such as streets and highways, water, sewer, etc., in place. These surplus sites vary in size from small parcels such as neighborhood primary schools to several-acre secondary school sites.

The location of these sites in established neighborhoods usually means that there will have to be large amounts of community input into any proposed development of the sites. If the community is in favor of the development its support is a valuable asset. But if the community is opposed to it, this opposition can prove to be a formidable obstacle in the development of affordable housing. It is important to seek community support by involving the community early on in the planning process. It is important to recognize the advantages of community support for development on any surplus property. Without this support the opposition could make a promising development unfeasible. It is therefore crucial when planning to develop a site that the developers work with the appropriate community groups and keep them involved and informed from the time of site acquisition to the final design aspects of the development.

Another important issue to consider is the fact that school districts are facing tremendous fiscal deficits as a result of Proposition 13. With the constant decline of enrollments and the effects of Proposition 13 starting to weigh heavily on district budgets, more and more surplus school sites are beginning to be identified. In light of the above, school districts are often in the position of having to sell their surplus properties in order to remain financially sound. These fiscal realities provide excellent opportunities for developers of affordable

housing to make use of these surplus properties immediately.

### Acquiring School Lands

Present regulations require every school district in the State to follow the sequence shown below before disposing of surplus properties at fair market value to local agencies and political subdivisions. The school district determines fair market value with the help of real estate agents and the State of California. (These conditions do not have to be followed when school properties are not owned by the State of California.) The steps which must be followed before disposition of surplus properties may occur:

1. The school district must first obtain State approval to sell the property;
2. There must be an appraisal of the property;
3. The school district offering the property for sale must have the approval of the city planning commission (Government Code 65402(d)).
4. The property must first be offered for sale for park and recreation uses pursuant to Government Code 54220 and Educational Codes 39363.5(a) and 81363.5(a). As a result, the following organizations must be notified by mail and given priority in the following order:
  - a. Any park and recreation department in the subject district, city, county, and region.
  - b. The local public housing authority, redevelopment agency, and local public agency involved in housing development in the district.
  - c. The State Resources Agency or any agency which succeeds to its power.

If one of the above agencies responds within 60 days after notification, then the property may be sold at fair market value or leased. If none of the above agencies responds within 60 days after notification, then the following agencies are offered the property at fair market value for sale or lease in the following order, as prescribed by Education Codes 5936.5(b) and 81363.5(b).



- d. The Regents of the University of California
- e. The Trustees of the California State University and College System
- f. The county or city in which the land is located
- g. The State Department of General Services

All of these entities must be notified of the land disposal in writing. All other public agencies in the state, public corporations, public authorities, and federal agencies are notified by public notice published in a newspaper of general circulation within the district. This would also include non-profit charitable corporations organized under Corporation Code Sections 10200 et seq. This public notice has to be published once a week for three successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation.

If no entity responds within 60 days the district must proceed to the next step, which is to:

- 5. Adopt a resolution of intent to sell the property at a regular school board meeting by two-thirds vote of the entire board. (Education Code 81365 and others)

Generally the school board will utilize a sealed bid process with a minimum price based upon the current appraisal of the property. Although outright sales are the rule, long-term leases (with or without an option to purchase) may be considered. The leasing term may run up to 99 years.

At any time after the public notice of the school board meeting to consider bids and prior to the meeting, the school district must notify the former owner, if any, in writing that he has the right to purchase the property at the tentatively accepted high bid. This notice does not amount to an offer to sell the property; it is simply a notification. (Education Code 39369.5)

Bids are then opened and considered at the public meeting, and while oral bids may be made they must also be submitted in writing. By resolution the high bid is accepted within 10 days of the receipt of bids. (Education Cods 39375 and 81374)

It would be highly advantageous for interested public and private housing developers to become acquainted with the business manager of local school districts in the areas of their interests, review the current inventory of surplus property, and ask to be notified of future offerings. To our knowledge, few housing developers are familiar with the above process of disposition.

## State of California Properties

The State Department of General Services (DGS) maintains a Property Land Index, which is an inventory of most lands owned by the State. The information contained in this Land Index is generally not available to the public. However, the General Services Department will respond to inquiries from the public concerning specific parcels in which there is an interest.

Sizes of parcels of land owned by the State vary as does location. Some parcels are less than an acre, while there are other parcels which are over three hundred acres in size. Locations vary from inner city urban areas to remote rural locations. Sometimes water, sewer, gas, and electric lines and other infrastructures are already in place. As the reader may have surmised, state properties may or may not be suitable for residential development. It is recommended that any party interested in obtaining and developing surplus property make certain that the property has the proper services or at the very least the potential for gaining proper zoning needed for residential development.

The California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) also creates surplus properties that are owned by the State of California. Surplus properties created by CalTrans are usually a result of the following:

- o During the early developmental phases of a freeway or highway project, certain parcels are acquired. Sometimes the entire parcel is not needed for the right-of-way of the road.
- o The periodic actions of the California Transportation Commission rescinding freeway and highway routes previously designated for development by CalTrans. These rescissions can result in large surplus land holdings which may be adaptable for a housing development.

These parcels also vary in size, shape, and location. The property might be adjacent to existing freeways or roads or it might represent a corridor through various sections of a community when a route is rescinded. Most CalTrans properties are in urban areas, but rural parcels do become available.

The Department of General Services is empowered to dispose of all surplus State-owned land except for land owned by CalTrans. (Government Code 11011) The two agencies dispose of their surplus properties

separately. Both CalTrans and DGS must comply with the requirements of Government Code Section 54220 et seq. before they offer the property for public sale. This statute provides that all state and local entities must offer to sell any surplus property which is capable of development to either a park or recreational area, or any local housing authority. (Government Codes 54221 and 54222) The statute also requires state and local entities when offering to sell all surplus real property to the local housing authority where the land is located at current fair-market value as determined by Government Code Section 54226. The statute does not indicate any priority between a housing authority and a parks and recreation agency when both want to purchase the same property. If neither the local housing entity nor the park or recreation area wish to purchase the property, it may then be offered for public sale.

#### Acquiring State Land from CalTrans

CalTrans has a staff of right-of-way agents whose responsibilities include the purchasing and disposal of surplus properties. All surplus property is reviewed jointly by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) for housing potential prior to the scheduling of a sales program. Any property that contains potential for housing development will be offered to public agencies that provide housing. If public agencies do not show interest in the property, non-profit and limited dividend developers are considered next. Any sale of surplus land for housing use must be negotiated by directed sale with the price based upon current fair market value. In all other cases, the normal disposition process is by sealed bids or an oral auction. CalTrans is obligated to receive fair market value for their surplus property, according to information received from the CalTrans District 4 office.

#### Acquiring State Land from the Department of General Services

Once the State Legislature has designated a piece of property as surplus, DGS can then begin the disposal process. As stated before, local park and recreation agencies and public housing authorities are the first to be offered the land. If these agencies express no interest in the property, DGS may transfer land with low and moderate income housing potential to local public agencies at a reasonable price which will enable the provision of such housing. At this point the State is in a position to sell the property at less than fair market value. The State Department of Housing and Community Development will confer with DGS and develop a selling price for the land which will enable the provision of low and moderate income housing.



If local agencies do not acquire the land General Services will then consider "housing sponsors." Housing sponsors, as defined by DGS, include cooperative housing corporations, non-profit organizations, limited dividend housing corporations, and private developers. These housing sponsors may acquire the land by lease or purchase at a cost that may be less than fair market value. Once again, DGS will confer with HCD on a suitable price that would enable the provision of affordable housing for low and moderate income people. This process is designated under Government Code 11011.1.

### Local Government Properties

Before selling any surplus property, local governments must comply with Government Code 54220 et seq. and offer to sell the land to parks and recreation agencies or to local housing authorities. If there is no interest by these agencies, then Government Code 50570 requires that local communities offer to sell the property to any housing corporation or non-profit corporation for the development of housing that could be made available to persons and families of low and moderate incomes.

Assembly Bill 3150, recently signed into law by the Governor, gives local communities broad discretion in setting prices for the transfer of property for low and moderate income housing purposes. Local government property can be sold or leased for the development of lower income housing at below fair market value. Under the conditions of this bill, any land sold must meet these requirements:

1. Eighty percent (80%) of the land must be used for housing development.
2. At least forty percent (40%) of the housing units must be made affordable to persons and families of low and moderate income.
3. Units must remain affordable to low and moderate income persons for at least thirty years but not more than forty years.

Currently, the provisions dealing specifically with local governments are very broad. The State merely requires that local communities dispose of their properties for the common benefit of the individual jurisdiction. The selling of surplus community-owned properties varies by jurisdiction because each community has its own specific program for relinquishing its surplus properties. In order to give the reader a broad perspective on how these various programs operate, three cities will be used as examples to outline the different procedures used when the selling of surplus land occurs. The three cities are San Francisco, Palo Alto, and Santa Rosa. Procedures can become operational only after State guidelines have been met.



## Example Disposal Procedure of Surplus City Properties

### The City/County of San Francisco

The City Planning Department has jurisdiction over the surplus property, but it notifies the City's Real Estate Department, which is responsible for the disposal of surplus properties. The steps involved in the disposition of the surplus properties are as follows:

1. Other City departments, the Housing Authority, and State Department of Resources are notified of availability of the property.
2. If no interest is expressed on the part of the other City departments or public agencies, the proposed sale of the property is referred to City Planning for determination as to zoning and for Master Plan approval.
3. If sale is found in conformity with the Master Plan, an ordinance is submitted to the Board of Supervisors for authorization to sell the property at public auction.
4. If sale is authorized, notices are sent to parties on mailing list, property is posted, and official advertisement placed.
5. Auction is held.
6. A resolution is submitted to the Board of Supervisors to confirm award to highest bidder.
7. Deed is prepared by Real Estate Department and presented to successful bidder upon payment of purchase price.

### The City of Palo Alto

The following are the steps used in the City of Palo Alto for the selling of surplus property:

1. When a City department no longer uses a property, that department notifies the Real Property Administrator, who then notifies other City departments that the property is surplus and may be available for other City departments.
2. In accordance with Government Code Section 54222, the Real Property Administrator then notifies the following agencies of the property disposal:

- o County of Santa Clara Park District
  - o Mid-Peninsula Open Space District
  - o State Resources Agency
  - o Housing Authority of Santa Clara  
County/Palo Alto Housing Corporation ,
3. Input from the department declaring the property surplus together with the responses from other departments and the agencies referred to above would then be forwarded to the Council with a staff recommendation to:
- a. Formally declare the property surplus, instruct the Real Estate Division to dispose of the property using open bid procedures, or
  - b. Transfer control of property to one or more City departments, or
  - c. Negotiate an agreement with one of the public agencies mentioned above.
4. Should the decision be to declare the property surplus and sell it by bid:
- a. The Real Estate Division would appraise (or have appraised) the property to determine a minimum bid.
  - b. The Real Estate Division would prepare a "proposal package" approved by City Manager, City Attorney, City Controller, Director of Budget, and Resource Management, Director of Purchasing, and Real Property Administrator.
  - c. This approved proposal package would be placed on the Council consent calendar for ratification.
  - d. Upon ratification by the Council:
    - o An ad would be placed in Palo Alto Times and San Jose Mercury.
    - o Flyers advising of the offering would be sent to all persons on Real Estate Division's "Surplus Property Mailing List."

- o Persons expressing further interest in offering would be sent a proposal package with a sealed bid envelope.
  - e. The bid opening is then scheduled by the Real Property Administrator and Director of Purchasing. At the bid opening, the Purchasing Department opens sealed bids and accepts oral bidding beginning at 5 percent above highest written bid.
  - f. The Real Estate Division shall forward the results of bidding to the Council with staff recommendations.
5. The City Council makes the final determination as to the disposition of the surplus property.

#### The City of Santa Rosa

The following are the procedures used in the City of Santa Rosa for the selling of surplus properties.

1. The City Council reviews all staff proposals, approved by City Manager, to declare any City land surplus and to offer the land for sale.
2. If the City Council determines there is merit in the staff proposal, it will refer proposal to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation.
3. The report and recommendations from the Planning Commission are received by City Council, and Council reviews it only when recommendations are inconsistent with Council determination.
4. If Planning Commission recommendations are consistent with Council's, the land is offered for public sale. All land is appraised before it is offered for sale.
5. Land which is readily marketable and unrestricted in its sale potential is sold to highest bidder at public auction either by oral or sealed bid, provided that the highest bid equals or exceeds

the minimum unpublished price established by the City prior to bid opening, which price shall not be lower than the amount shown on the appraisal. Notice of the sale by bid is published in a newspaper of general circulation at least ten days prior to bid opening. If sealed bids are requested, each must be accompanied by deposit in form of certified or cashier's check made payable to City in amount equal to at least 10 percent of bid amount. After sealed bids are opened, oral bids are permitted from bidders who can meet the 10 percent deposit requirement. Any oral bid must be at least 10 percent higher than highest sealed bid. If the person whose bid is accepted fails to pay the total bid price within thirty days from acceptance of bid, the bidder's deposit is forfeited and property may be offered for sale to the next highest bidder. The Council shall be notified of bids received or, if applicable, the fact that no bids had been received.

6. If no bids are received or no bids deemed acceptable to the City, then Property Manager may proceed with negotiated sale either by private effort or through listing with a real estate broker for inclusion in the multiple listing system. A listing may include payment of real estate commissions not to exceed six percent of purchase price. The purchase price may not be less than the amount of the appraisal without the consent of the City Council.
7. Land declared to be surplus which is not readily marketable because of its odd shape or lack of sufficient area to meet minimum space requirements for building in the particular zone in which it is located, or which is landlocked or otherwise lacking in sales potential, may be sold by taking offers or by negotiation with adjoining landowners provided the purchase price agreed upon is within 10 percent of the appraisal.

Though the differences may be subtle, it is important to remember that local governments can follow their own procedures of surplus property disposal. After local communities meet the State requirements, they are free to accept bids, sell land at an auction, or whatever.



The provisions stated in this chapter illustrate constraints and opportunities for selling surplus properties for the potential development of low and moderate income housing. The constraints are obvious. There are so many guidelines that must be met before a surplus property can be sold that a burdensome restriction is placed on the utilization of the property for low and moderate income housing. With the enactment of Senate Bill 853 in January 1980, local agencies, redevelopment agencies, and housing authorities have been added as entities entitled to notice of intent to dispose of surplus land and to the first opportunity to purchase surplus land for low and moderate income housing purposes. This will definitely facilitate the process and make it even more possible for surplus lands to be used for affordable housing.

State and city owned properties are available to be purchased at below market rate but this is up to the discretion of the owner jurisdiction. School districts are being hard pressed for money because of the effects of Proposition 13. With huge deficits in their budgets, school districts cannot afford to sell any surplus property below fair market value.

In light of all the above, the State needs to enact legislation that will enable all surplus properties to be sold to agencies that will develop low and moderate income housing. The need persists, the land is available now, and governmental participation is needed.

Note: Parts of the information in this section were provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, the City of San Francisco, the City of Santa Rosa, and the City of Palo Alto.

### III. THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY INTERACTION IN THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Discussion of developing low and moderate income housing in a neighborhood that has already established its social, cultural, and economic character often raises community opposition. This opposition can come from the residents in the community/neighborhood and/or the local officials representing that community/neighborhood. Presently many surplus properties are located in neighborhoods that are surrounded by single-family homes. Established residents frequently oppose development of any kind in their neighborhood, but especially development of housing for low and moderate income people. This opposition usually stems from fears that property values will decrease as the neighborhood becomes accessible to people of lower incomes. There are many misconceptions and preconceived notions about what housing for low and moderate income people is, what it looks like, and how it can be used to address the present housing needs of the community itself.

This section stresses the importance of early interaction between local officials, developers, and community/neighborhood residents. This was one of the main areas of interest which was expressed in our interviews. People interviewed stressed the fact that early community involvement to guide the planning of proposed affordable housing developments avoids concentrated citizen outcry and makes it feasible to make major changes in design. Community representatives stressed that it is important for the developer to involve the community in every step of the development process early on. Elected officials, school district officials, planning officials, builders/developers, non-profit housing development organizations, and legal aid society representatives all agreed that community involvement was the essential ingredient that can make or break the potential development of affordable housing on surplus properties.

#### Responses Received on the Use of Surplus Properties for Affordable Housing

When owners of surplus properties were asked the question, "What kinds of community restraints or neighborhood opposition might need to be overcome if affordable housing were proposed on any of their identified surplus sites?", the following comments were received:

"Most sites that are well-situated for residential development would probably meet more severe political and community opposition, especially the school sites, since they are located in the midst of higher income, single family detached unit neighborhoods." City official in Alameda County.

"A series of public hearings on low and moderate income housing has already indicated there would be very strong opposition to any significant changes from present use." High school district official in Contra Costa County.

"Neighbors oppose high density developments based on incompatibility with surrounding area." City official in Napa County.

"In an area where the homes are worth more than \$100,000, the residents and city government would totally oppose this." School district official in San Mateo County.

"Opposition on all sites because low and moderate income housing is not what people want to see in their areas." School district official in Santa Clara County.

"It depends on the design of the development." City official in Sonoma County.

"There would be resistance because the city council is split on this subject." School district official in Santa Clara County.

"Opposition is considerable, traffic congestion, loss of open space, and deterioration of neighborhoods are the main concerns." School district official in Santa Clara County.

"Some foreseeable neighborhood opposition could surface with questions raised regarding density, neighborhood character, traffic and parking, tax-exempt status, and open space." City official in Alameda County.

"The residents in the neighborhood would have to be reassured that the neighborhood would not turn into a slum." School district official in Marin County.

Many of the statements made in response to this question are similar in that many respondents share the same basic fears of having affordable housing developments in already existing neighborhoods. Opposition towards using surplus properties for the development of affordable housing for low and moderate income people is prevalent throughout many parts of the Bay Area. To provide needed housing, these concerns must be addressed by everyone involved in the housing development process.

## Solutions

A Bay Area elected official suggested the following:

"The most significant problem that exists in selling surplus publicly-owned properties to an entity interested in developing affordable housing is community resistance. If a community is against the intrusion of developing affordable housing on a surplus property located in their neighborhood, then logically speaking, that community's political constituency is going to actively support the views of the community. It is important to realize that political and community views go hand-in-hand, but the root of the problem lies in actively seeking the input of the community in all stages of the plan."

He continued by stating:

"The most significant means of eliminating community opposition is to educate the community about the need for affordable housing and the way surplus properties can support this growing need. The first step in educating the community is to educate the leaders in that community. Community leaders serve as a starting point that will enable developers, planning officials, and planning commissions to utilize a mechanism that will put them in contact with the heart of the community. By educating the community through their own community leaders of the need for their support and advice concerning project design and management before the project is implemented, considerable resistance can be overcome. It is through this increased understanding that progress can be made."



## The Developer's Role

It is strongly recommended that any developer that has his/her sights set on a surplus property get involved with the community which he/she intends to be working with. Developers should either become actively involved with the community or hire a community relations representative to work with residents. The important tasks are:

1. Ask the community what they want.
2. In the case of rental units, ensure residents that the development will have good management and upkeep after it is built. This should be done through a written agreement.
3. Ensure residents that architectural design will contain elements that are sensitive to community needs.
4. Developments designed to house families should be at manageable densities.

Reasons for Task #4 are: Development containing many families have posed management problems in the past. Smaller developments at no more than 25 units per acre or housing on scattered sites appear to have a much better chance of success, according to HUD and other housing experts.

The development should create a mechanism that will inform citizens about any changes or new activities that come about involving the development. This can be done by calling a community meeting or informing the residents through a flyer or newsletter. The developer should also set up procedures for general community meetings calling on all interested parties to bring their comments or suggestions. The developer should also have at all meetings a representative that will serve as a mediator to assist in the process of negotiated development for all projects that require community input. The mediator should be an individual that is impartial to both the developer and the community. This individual could be a city council person, a member of the planning commission, or a representative with experience and knowledge in the field of environmental concerns.

In addition, the developer must have a solid grasp of city land use policies, city growth management policies, city housing element policies, along with knowledge of the city's general plan. This would serve to ensure that the developer is meeting all city policies and land use procedures while addressing the needs of the community. From the outset of the initial stages of the planning process, the developer should actively seek out any element of the community/neighborhood that has the power to support or block the proposed development and encourage them to become involved.

When a strong and fluid rapport has been developed between citizens, developers, the city, and other interested parties, a balanced plan that addresses the future housing needs of the area, community/neighborhood goals, city goals, and the developer's goals can be put into action. Every party involved in this group should put plans and agreements in writing to show how each phase of development will fit into the agreements made in the decision-making process. The developers should also devise a clear sequence of events that will illustrate all development phases from start to finish. It is important that all agreements be put into writing so that no party can change what was originally proposed and so that future misunderstandings can be avoided.

One developer from the East Bay had these comments to make concerning community participation:

"Many times in the past we have gone into a community and just started putting up our housing developments without community input. In one instance we were building in a neighborhood that would tear down and destroy any type of progress made on a small low and moderate income project we were working on. It happened that almost every night after we went home vandals would come in and destroy what we had done earlier in the day. This went on for a number of months until we had to abandon the project. It was becoming too costly to continue the project because we would always have to replace what was destroyed. We tried security guards, and that became too costly. It just was not worth it....I know through experience that it is always best to involve the community before the project gets started and keep them involved until the end."

Another concern that should be brought up is the sincerity of the developers. He/she should listen carefully to community concerns and ideas and take immediate action on the ideas that are feasible. As for the ideas that are not feasible, the developer should give direct and honest responses as to why something may not be feasible. The developer should focus on community needs and concerns and where possible provide amenities that would make the proposed development acceptable to the community/neighborhood. Examples of amenities include parks, off-street parking, open space, bicycle or pedestrian pathways, sports facilities, community recreation rooms, childcare centers, landscaping, or whatever is indicated by the community that would make the development more politically feasible and socially acceptable.

Any developer that initiates early contact with community residents, planning staffs, and planning commissions can reap the benefits of his/her venture. He/she can avoid unexpected opposition and may see the project move along much more smoothly. The developer will have assistance in promoting the development and will give others the opportunity

to participate and actively guide appropriate development as set forth by the participants.

## Legislation

A number of individuals interviewed (i.e., public decision-makers, legal aid societies, planning officials, etc.) suggested that the State of California should enact legislation that would mandate early community participation as a part of the environmental assessment and permit process. This would aid active community participation and would also assure that problems or mitigation measures would be considered early enough so that they could be more feasibly implemented. In many cases, this would be sufficient to avoid problems within the community, but it would be useless if community participation is not a mandatory requirement.

## Role of Surplus Property Owners

Owners of surplus properties can also help reduce community opposition. When the owner jurisdiction plans to sell a surplus property, it is important that these steps be taken:

1. Inform the community that the property is surplus for sale.
2. Inform the community of the potential uses of the property in accordance with zoning and general plan regulations.
3. Keep the community informed of the negotiations going on involving the sale of the property.
4. Inform the community to whom the property has been sold, and their intended use of the property.

In the case of a school district, one final comment: School districts must have a working relationship with city departments to fulfill a smooth process in selling their surplus properties.



#### IV. THE NEED FOR BETTER INTERAGENCY COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION

The need for better communication and coordinated interaction between local communities, school districts, and state entities are topics that many interviewees believe deserve much more attention and emphasis. The lack of well-coordinated systems of communication between these agencies is known to be one of the major obstacles stopping or delaying the development of more affordable housing. However, many people believe that these problems can be eliminated if certain efforts are made by the agencies involved.

If Federal, State, and local agencies are to involve themselves in the development of affordable housing using the Bay Area's abundant supply of surplus lands, then better communication must be established between State and local jurisdictions that own surplus properties. In his March 1980 speech, Governor Brown ordered all State departments to prepare an inventory which lists all lands they control by deed or long-term leasehold that were not presently in use or required by the State. This Executive Order implemented one of the major components of the Administration's Urban Strategy--to make available to local governments surplus lands which are suitable for the development of low and moderate income housing which would generate more housing opportunities. Now that this Executive Order mandates the use of inner-city surplus land for low and moderate income housing developments, open lines of communication are needed to inform developers, cities, and any jurisdictions which are interested in developing affordable housing, where the properties are located, what developmental constraints exist on the property, city zoning and other growth management procedures, procedures for land disposal, and the degree of community opposition that may be encountered. By making it mandatory that jurisdictions keep inventories of surplus properties and making sure that these inventories are available for public inspection, communication can be opened to a larger body of individuals interested in the development of affordable housing.

This section will present examples of how a lack of interagency communication can create problems between owners of surplus properties, developers, and local jurisdictions. It will conclude with some suggestions that will enhance the growth of more viable lines of communication and processes that jurisdictions may use to expedite the implementation of affordable housing development.



## Examples of Non-Communication Between Agencies

A school district official in the Northern Bay Area gives a good example of limited communication and the problems it leads to. He stated, "The most formidable problems that restrict a school district in the selling of their surplus properties are:

1. Not understanding city zoning policies and when, where, and how to get zoning changes;
2. City growth management policies; and
3. Being restricted to disposing of surplus properties by the Education Code."

Problems stemming from these three areas are to the disadvantage of the school district, as is illustrated by the following example. The school district owned a surplus property that was zoned for single-family residences, but all interested developers wanted to build multi-family housing on the site. Before any developer was willing to make a bid on the site, the school district had to have the zoning changed from single-family to multi-family through the city planning department. The school district requested a rezoning, but when it came before the planning commission it was denied. The school district appealed the decision and finally, after some heated debates, the zoning change was approved by the planning commission and the city council. The approval was okayed with the stipulation that whichever developer was given the final bid for the surplus property had to agree to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). At this point many developers began making bids for the site. Finally, when a bid was submitted and accepted, the developer found out that the city had a growth management plan that would allow only a certain number of housing units to be built annually. The city had a housing development waiting list that was nearly three years long. Therefore, any developer that purchased the surplus school site would have a three-year wait before construction could commence. In light of this newly discovered stipulation the developer retracted his bid and because of the three-year wait no other developer would make a bid for the property.

Because of the school district's lack of knowledge and understanding about local city policy, the school district could not sell its surplus property and in turn was losing money. Once again the school district had to approach the city council and the planning commission to attempt to become exempt from the city's growth management plan. After long and tedious debates, the planning commission and the city council exempted the site from the growth management plan. The principal reasons the school district was granted an exemption was because it was losing money and would continue to do so in the foreseeable future. Their budget deficit was so huge that if the site was not sold the district would need State bailout funds to continue operating. However, in granting the exemption, the city specified that:

1. The property had to be totally developed by the end of 1980; and
2. The development had to be a Planned Unit Development with 100 units of multi-family housing.

In essence, the city was interested in building affordable housing, but because of the lack of communication between the school district, the city planning department, the planning commission, the city council, and all interested developers the opportunity to develop affordable housing was almost lost. This situation could have been avoided if each entity was familiar with the policy regulations of the other.

In another example, a South Bay school district wanted to sell five acres of surplus property that had not been zoned for residential uses. In order to sell the property, the school district would have to get the property zoned for multiple-unit residential use. Most of the developers who wanted to make bids on the property wanted it to be zoned for high density multiple units. However, the city council, the planning department, and the planning commission were totally opposed to multiple-unit zoning, and since the city's general plan had designated the area for single-family homes there was no cause for them to make changes in the general plan or zoning ordinance. As a consequence, the city was not interested in rezoning and the school district could not attract any potential buyers because of the obstacles to having zoning and general plan changes made. The school district took the necessary steps toward obtaining a zoning change by presenting its case before the planning commission, the zoning board, and the city council. Each entity had to approve the changes. When the school district failed to get the approval it needed by going through the appropriate channels, its only alternative was to take the matter to the courts. After paying \$10,000 to hire attorneys the school district lost the court battle when the court denied the request for zoning and general plan changes.

In this case, not only was there a lack of communication between the different entities involved, but there was also a lack of cooperation and effort to work together towards addressing the need for affordable housing.

In one other example, a school district official in the East Bay stated,

"The major problem we have is adhering to the State Education Code regarding the disposal of surplus properties. The Education Code puts a major restriction on the profits that a school district can make in that a school district must accept only fair market bid for any piece of surplus property that is for sale."

This official felt that he could get much more than fair market value for the property, and even if the district was able to get more than fair market, the proceeds would have to go back to the State of California. Many school district officials felt that all or most of the proceeds made by the sale of the site should go back to the school district.

A planning official in an East Bay community which has a number of surplus properties says he would like to utilize surplus property to develop affordable housing, but "the Article 34b referendum, which requires a majority of voter approval before the development of low income housing using State funds can proceed, proves to be a major roadblock to the production of low income housing." He went on to state, "Affluent communities will remain untouched by low income housing because of Article 34b. Areas like ours offer the best location to build affordable housing because impactation of high density developments has not occurred. Article 34b puts a stop to this ever happening.... By allowing this law to exist, the State of California is taking away the right of low income people (to have) a stake in a piece of property."

Article 34b, which was passed in 1950 by the real estate interests of the State, makes it very difficult for local communities to address the needs of low income people by requiring voter approval whenever a development using State funds will have occupancy of 50 percent or more of low income people. There has been several attempts to revise or eliminate this State law, but all have failed to date.

The examples above illustrate the need for better communication between all entities involved in the development of affordable housing. There is a need to eliminate existing barriers between school districts, builders/developers, local jurisdictions, elected officials, and private citizens. By facilitating and encouraging communication about specific policy procedures and the various governmental bodies involved in the process, understanding will be enhanced and there will be less confusion. Similarly, it is important that all levels of government take responsibility for assuring that affordable housing units are built within their communities. It should be stressed that surplus properties located in the Bay Area are a resource that will aid in addressing the needs of low and moderate income people.



## V. ROLE MODELS AND SUGGESTIONS

In this, the final section, interviewees were asked the following question: "What role can you and others in similar positions play in making the development of affordable housing on surplus properties more feasible?" This section will focus on the responses to this question, and it will hopefully increase understanding for persons in similar positions to become better acquainted with the suggestions being offered. The respondents felt that their answers to this question were feasible and could be implemented.

### Local Elected Officials

According to a Peninsula elected official:

"Politicians can best serve as educators and policy-makers. They would first of all have to be in favor of the development of affordable housing. Once this has been established, elected officials can serve to educate planners, communities, and other elected officials on the need for affordable housing. Elected officials can foster the development of affordable housing by stressing the need due to the poor economic conditions that our country is now in. Because it is nearly impossible to afford housing in today's market, a new substitute must come into being, and that is affordable housing developments. And since we do have an abundance of surplus properties available, it is more feasible to utilize them for this purpose....Elected officials should develop and keep active a countywide housing task force that has individuals from different facets of the government and a broad spectrum of community organizations. On a yearly basis this task force should address the housing needs of the area. By addressing these needs early, future considerations can be made for purchasing available surplus property for housing development."

Another elected official stated:

"No public body is charged with taking the lead in helping clarify what kind of development a community would like and support. Elected officials could serve as mediators who would bring together community interest groups and developers in order to mediate discussions about how to implement the development of affordable housing on surplus properties."



He continued by saying:

"The elected official can aid by holding informal roundtable discussions with leaders of community groups concerned with land use and housing while at the same time having similar roundtable discussions with developers, leaders in the building trades and local business people. The goal of these procedures is to promote meaningful discussion by helping all parties come to a more realistic understanding of each other's position and problems."

One final comment brought up by an elected official was:

"Elected officials can mandate local policy (if they have the support of other council or board members) similar to that of local housing elements stating that low and moderate income housing developments would have priority use for any surplus properties located within their jurisdiction."

While this idea is good when applied to city/county-owned parcels, it would not apply to State and school district surplus properties because different policies would mandate their disposal.

#### School District Officials

School district officials, in general, felt that in order to facilitate the use of surplus properties for the development of affordable housing, they had to become better aware of the opportunities and obstacles that exist to the selling of these properties. With that in mind, school district officials were very much in agreement on the following five steps which would better define their role:

1. Hire a surplus property agent to handle property sales and the problems involved.

Many school district officials mentioned the fact that an entity within their office should be informed about the land use, zoning, and general plans along with all policy regulations of the cities/county where their surplus properties are located. This would facilitate better communication between school districts and local communities.

2. Remain on good terms with the city/county and always be aware of all local policies of the local governing bodies.

3. Be aware of the zoning of surplus properties and the policy procedures that must be dealt with when seeking zoning changes.
4. Keep an updated inventory of surplus properties and the potential development constraints for each property.
5. Make sure developers are aware of the changes needed and the problems they may encounter when attempting to develop any surplus site.

Every school district official stressed that these are the major conditions that would better facilitate negotiations for affordable housing development on their surplus properties. Another suggestion made was to establish a site committee comprised of residents and school board officials. The function of the committee would be to deal with the use of surplus sites after the decision to close a school had been made by the school board.

#### Planning Officials

Planning officials identified the following four items which can facilitate the development of more affordable housing:

1. Incorporate guidelines to encourage city council/board of supervisor support for affordable housing needs and development.
2. Provide provisions in the general plan which would encourage the development of affordable housing in the future.
3. Allow and encourage zoning changes that would address community housing needs.
4. Revise existing growth management ordinances to include a stated percentage goal of new housing built on an annual basis for low and moderate income persons.

A South Bay planning official stated the following:

"City and county planning department staff members should encourage effective citizen participation. The need to provide clear guidelines for all participants on how the development process would work."

An East Bay planning official stated:

"It would be very good to suggest that planner convene working sessions on all developments that create controversy, or serve as staff or mediator at citizens advisory boards and provide consultation on such projects.:

#### Incentives from the City

The only way more affordable housing units can be developed is through cooperation in both the private and public sectors. The following suggestions can be used by the city in conjunction with for-profit and non-profit developers as incentives to entice developers to develop more affordable housing units on surplus properties. City planning officials suggested the use of these ideas:

- o Fast-track permit processing: create a one-stop permit office which would contain a checklist of procedures that developers must follow when applying for building permits. This would speed up the approval process without allowing any important factors to go unconsidered.
- o Landbanking programs: the purchasing and holding of surplus land for the future development of low income housing should be actively pursued. Landbanking is the purchase of developable land by a jurisdiction for the specific use of providing affordable housing. The land can be purchased while the price is still relatively low for later use. The funds for landbanking have usually come out of cities'/counties' Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) monies. Surplus properties are prime candidates for applying landbanking techniques.
- o Below-market rate program: a below-market rate housing program does just what the name implies, furnishes home ownership (and sometimes rental) opportunities to low and moderate income people at below-market rates. The program is most often enacted through an inclusionary zoning ordinance, which specifies that all new residential developments above a certain size must include a certain percentage of units affordable to low and moderate income people. The developer often receives certain incentives from the local jurisdiction in return. Some of the most common incentives include: a density bonus, fast-track processing, some relaxation of building standards, development fee waivers, off-street parking requirement modifications or waivers or other similar conditions.

- o Mortgage revenue bonds: tax exempt mortgage revenue bonds are a source of funds which may be used to raise money for mortgage loans. This money which is generated by the bonds can then be issued at below-market rates for both single family owner-occupied homes and for multi-unit rental housing. The loans may be used for rehabilitation or new construction. Outstanding mortgage loans are collateral for the bonds. Housing finance agencies are created to issue such bonds, but other agencies such as housing authorities, local governments, and Federally chartered savings and loan associations may also do so.

### Non-Profit Housing Development Corporations

The following suggestions were made by representatives from an East Bay non-profit housing development corporation:

"You should use scattered sites to disperse affordable housing instead of lumping it all in one location. Whenever developing affordable housing, avoid building large projects. Seek to build affordable housing in jurisdictions where inclusionary land use zoning policies are operating. By opting for a mixed use pattern where the developer mixes single-family housing with condominiums and low and moderate income housing, he/she would have more success in building affordable units with little or no opposition."

In short, "A non-profit housing development organization's major purpose is to promote, institute, and sponsor the development of housing for low and moderate income people," as stated by an Oakland-based non-profit housing development corporation representative. "The major reason for setting up such an organization is the fact that the housing needs of the area are not being met by the government or private enterprise."

As stated by another East Bay organization member:

"The success of a non-profit organization depends on an established Board of Directors that work well with city officials and government. The board should consist of individuals who recognize the housing needs of low and moderate income people, both now and in the future. These individuals should have knowledge of the housing field, financing methods, management, planning, and architecture. This expertise is all important."



There are three basic ways in which a non-profit housing development corporation (HDC) may sponsor assisted housing:

1. The non-profit may assemble a development package and sell it to a profit-motivated developer. The package usually consists of a site, a project design, the necessary permits, and in some cases, preliminary financing commitments. The advantage of this method is that the non-profit can get low and moderate income housing built while ending its involvement early in the process and going on to other projects. The disadvantage of this method is that the HDC loses control over the development at the time of sale.
2. The non-profit may participate in a joint venture with a for-profit developer. Though it usually performs the same functions as in the first method, the non-profit HDC usually can retain more control over the development and gain a great deal of experience while benefitting from the financial resources of the for-profit developer. In this option, however, the non-profit has a longer term involvement, and will have to negotiate the rights and responsibilities of the two partners. Compromises may be necessary.
3. In the third approach, the non-profit is the developer. In this case the group must have a great deal of experience and knowledge. In return, the group has total control over the development. A disadvantage of this option is that it requires more money, time, effort, skill, and capability on the part of the non-profit. In addition, the group bears all of the risk.

The most serious problem for any non-profit HDC is funding. The group will need predevelopment--or "seed"--money from the start, when the housing development is still in the planning stages. Funds are available from foundations, local corporations, and banks. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) also has predevelopment money available.

The predevelopment funds will be used to pick a suitable site, engage an architect to produce a set of preliminary drawings, have a contractor make a preliminary cost estimate, and prepare an application to the appropriate government agency for funding the actual project.

HUD is the major source of money for low and moderate income housing. Probably the best-known source of funding for new housing construction is the Section 8 New Construction Program. The California Department

of Housing and community Development (HCD) has a new program which will provide money for the construction of rental housing. In this program, 30 percent of the units must be available to people in the low income category, while the remainder may be market-rate units, or units affordable to moderate income households. Below-market rate financing will be available in tandem with this program through the California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA).

Because adequate and sustained funding for seed money and development is a problem that is worsening over time, many non-profit housing development corporations are turning to "equity syndication" for funds. This technique involves setting up a limited partnership with private investors who are seeking a tax shelter for their money. The program works as follows: through the property depreciation allowance, a low and moderate income project can generate substantial tax losses for an owner. These losses can be used to offset taxes on other income. The tax loss which such a project generates often exceeds that which a non-profit developer can utilize to offset taxes on his/her other income. Instead, this tax shelter is marketed to those who can best use it--doctors, lawyers, businessmen, and others in the 50 percent tax bracket. The proceeds from the sale of tax shelters provide funds for the non-profit activities or developments. That is, the HDC can "roll over" funds and use them again for a new development. This technique allows the non-profit developer to take advantage of "leveraging," which will maximize the use of the funds th HDC has available.

The crucial drawback to this method is that the non-profit HDC may lose some control over the housing development process, because the profit-motivated sponsor will want some control over his/her investment. There is also the possibility of adverse community reaction to the fact that some investors will reap a financial gain from the project. Thus, the whole process should be carefully explained to the community. The big advantage of sydication is that it can provide the non-profit developer with a steady and sufficient source of funds to build and manage low and moderate income housing developments.

### Builders-Developers

"The problem with private builders and developers is that their motivation is to get the highest net return on any development, and in building low and moderate income housing a developer does not get the highest net return. If there is some motivation or incentive to end profit-motivated ventures then more low and moderate income housing will be built." Statement from an East Bay developer.

All developeprs interviewed agreed that local political and community opposition is the major obstacle that stands in the way of developing affordable housing on surplus properties. "School district and city owned

surplus properties offer the best opportunity for housing development because the infrastructure is already in place. State properties also offer opportunities but sometimes the infrastructure is absent. Political and community opposition are major problems, too." Stated by an East Bay developer/builder. In general, the following suggestions were offered by Bay Area builders/developers:

1. Focus building in areas where there is the least amount of political and community resistance.
2. Make use of private housing development programs sponsored by HUD, such as Section 203b, Section 8, and Section 221(d)(4).
3. Every city should adopt a Housing Assistance Plan with HUD acting as an enforcing agent making sure that certain properties are ear-marked for affordable housing developments. Relate this housing assistance plan to an inventory of surplus properties, utilizing them for affordable housing development.
4. Look to develop affordable housing through the jurisdictions that use inclusionary land use measures, density bonuses, and development fee reductions.
5. Develop adequate community support facilities and provide amenities to the community.
5. Encourage active community participation in all phases of the development process. Identify a process of early dialogue between developers, community groups, planning departments.

One final suggestion came from an East Bay developer. He stated, "By encouraging the state government to put into policy a regionwide no growth tax, then communities would be put in the position of having to build their share of affordable housing. If a city does not meet its stated share of affordable housing units built, then a tax would be applied to that city as a form of penalty. The proceeds from this tax would be put into a State fund that would later be used to develop affordable housing on surplus properties."



## Legal Aid Societies

The one legal aid society that was interviewed offered a few suggestions as to how they can help in developing more affordable housing.

1. Adoption of legally-sufficient, programatically-sound housing elements/housing programs for the communities in the legal aid's jurisdiction.
2. Diligent and consistent implementation of housing elements/housing programs should be adopted.
3. Meeting the need for legal and technical assistance that exists on the part of non-profit sponsors or potential sponsors of affordable housing.
4. Increased public awareness of the housing problem, laws obligating the county/cities to address their housing problem, and ways by which the problem can be alleviated.

Legal Aid Societies should mainly serve to eliminate legal and institutional barriers to an expanded housing supply. Legal aid societies should seek to follow these four guidelines. (For a more detailed and informative elaboration of the goals, please see "Proposal of the Legal Aid Society of Marin County to the San Francisco Foundation for Funding--A Fair Share Housing Project").

## Community Organization Leaders

Community leaders, in general, voiced this opinion, "Citizens should be involved early in the planning process. If a developer approaches us and gives us a chance to respond and be heard, then we may be more receptive to the development. We need better techniques for public participation and more opportunities for personal interaction with the city, the developer and other interested parties. If a developer just comes in and plops a plan in the community without our consultation, then we will most certainly react adversely to such a proposal."

Another community leader stated, "If the developer listens and provides amenities that will benefit both the existing community and the new development, then he may have less opposition." She continued by stating, "Community involvement should be built into the environmental impact report (EIR) program budget as a mandatory issue. Without it we will fight to keep our school sites or any surplus property in our neighborhood free of any type of housing."



## State of California

The State Department of Housing and Community Development has traditionally sought to utilize surplus properties for the development of affordable housing. It has been stated that the State take a stronger stance in insuring that all surplus properties are used in a fashion that will enable the infill of urban areas. The following suggestions were made by a representative from the State of California:

1. Make it mandatory for state, cities and school districts to keep yearly inventories of surplus properties.
2. Amend the Article 34b Referendum to better enable cities to meet their fair share of the affordable housing needs.
3. Allow revision in the State Education Code allowing school districts more flexibility in the selling of their properties and allowing them to make a profit or even write down the cost of land.
4. Enforce local housing element policies and review them to make sure every city is building their share of affordable housing.
5. Enforce mandatory citizen participation laws in the EIR process.

These ideas and suggestions hopefully have provided insight on how different entities can improve the process of affordable housing development on surplus properties. It is certain that some of this information may seem obvious to the reader, but it is important to provide this information to all interested parties. It provides readers with insight as to what they can do and also serves to better acquaint people with the points of view of other individuals.

## VI. SUMMARY

During the course of preparing this report, three key needs were identified:

1. A need for greater community participation in the development process;
2. A need for more knowledge of different jurisdictions' policies and procedures involving the use of surplus properties; and
3. A need for better interagency communication and coordination between the entities involved in the development of affordable housing and the sale of surplus properties.

The mandatory adoption of citizen participation in the EIR process could serve to reduce substantially the amount of community opposition encountered when affordable housing development is being considered on surplus properties. In addition, increased knowledge on the part of all entities involved of other entities policies and procedures would definitely enhance communication. Better knowledge of the different policies involving all parties has the potential of creating better interagency communication and coordination.

Through interviews with individuals involved in the housing field this report has hopefully provided an overview of the most pressing issues and possible solutions to the use of surplus properties as an affordable housing resource. Widespread understanding of the pressing need for more affordable housing units in communities throughout the Bay Area is a long-term education process. However, once this need has been established and recognized on a regionwide basis by all Bay Area citizens, it will be realized that surplus properties are one resource in addressing this crucial housing need.

By utilizing the many acres of available surplus properties in our urban areas, development costs could be cut because there are existing city services and programs available to utilize these lands to their fullest extent. Furthermore, development will be encouraged on infill sites which can preserve valuable and environmentally sensitive lands. It was commonly agreed by all respondents that using surplus publicly-owned properties for the development of affordable housing is one of the more progressive means of meeting Bay Area housing needs. It was also commonly agreed that new policy should be created to enable this provision to occur as expeditiously as possible.

8/01922  
Appendix A

SURPLUS LANDS STUDY

APPENDIX A

SURVEY RESULTS

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 13 1981

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

MAY 1980





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. JURISDICTIONS THAT RECEIVED THE SURVEY WITHIN:	
A. Alameda County . . . . .	3
B. Contra Costa County . . . . .	3
C. Marin County . . . . .	4
D. Napa County . . . . .	5
E. San Francisco County . . . . .	5
F. San Mateo County . . . . .	5
G. Santa Clara County . . . . .	6
H. Solano County . . . . .	7
I. Sonoma County . . . . .	7
III. JURISDICTIONS THAT CONTAIN AVAILABLE SURPLUS LAND:	
A. Alameda County . . . . .	9
B. Contra Costa County . . . . .	16
C. Marin County . . . . .	21
D. Napa County . . . . .	25
E. San Francisco County . . . . .	27
F. San Mateo County . . . . .	30
G. Santa Clara County . . . . .	35
H. Solano County . . . . .	42
I. Sonoma County . . . . .	45
IV. LIST OF SITES THAT HAVE ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS AS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS . . . . .	47
V. SUMMARY . . . . .	56
APPENDIX I: SURVEY/QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	59
APPENDIX II: ZONING DEFINITIONS . . . . .	65
APPENDIX III: HUD SITE REQUIREMENTS . . . . .	67



## I. INTRODUCTION

This report is an inventory of surplus sites in the Bay Area that could be made available for development of affordable housing. Because housing problems in the region have reached crisis proportions, the need to find land suitable for new housing has become greater than ever. This report represents a first step in a very long and complicated process.

The problem of finding decent housing at an affordable price is no longer a problem for solely the poor and the elderly. Middle income people and young families with incomes of \$16,000 - \$25,000 are increasingly being squeezed out of the housing market. The overall consequence of this situation, contrary to popular myth, is that a substantial proportion of the Bay Area's population needs some form of assistance in order to obtain housing. According to estimates of local jurisdictions, 22% of all households in the region need some form of public assistance, both in the rental and ownership markets. At the present time funds for this purpose are wholly inadequate.

This report focuses on surplus lands owned by Bay Area cities, school districts and the State of California that could possibly be used for the development of affordable housing.

The growing need for housing obviously places greater pressures on available land and land prices. Where suitable land is owned by public agencies the potential exists for developing affordable housing if the land can be made available at prices somewhat below market costs. At the same time, the financial problems facing most public agencies at this time may preclude substantial write-downs in land prices.

Over the past few years, a number of budget cuts have occurred in many jurisdictions throughout California. Many of these cuts have been the result of the passage of Proposition 13 in June, 1978. These budget cuts have put many local jurisdictions and school districts in the position of needing additional funds in order to continue operations.

As a consequence of the above and other factors, many local jurisdictions and school districts have made decisions to sell/lease some of their present landholdings. The selling/leasing of these surplus sites provides a possible resource for the development of low and moderate income family, elderly/handicapped, mixed, and cooperative residential developments. Obviously a number of complex issues must be successfully resolved before such land can be used for this kind of housing.

### How This Report Was Prepared

This is the first in a series of three working papers, and it identifies surplus lands suitable for residential development. In order to make this determination a questionnaire was distributed to all Bay Area jurisdictions and school districts listed in Section II. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. Subsequent working papers

will (1) seek to investigate the issues surrounding the use of surplus land for the provision of affordable housing for low and moderate income people; and (2) describe current and potential efforts to use surplus lands to provide affordable housing alternatives.

In this paper, there are gaps in information for some jurisdictions and school districts. Some of these gaps exist simply because some of the information was either unobtainable or unknown at the time the questionnaire was completed and returned. In other instances, some parcels were identified to be surplus, but were said to be undevelopable with no further explanation. Still other jurisdictions chose not to respond to the questionnaire at all.

One final note--the information contained in this working paper is current as of April, 1980. As time passes, the information will become obsolete and outdated. Some sites may be lost as they are sold for other purposes. It takes time to build both political support and housing units, and if a jurisdiction must increase revenues expeditiously, it may chose not to wait. Some of the sites in this report can offer relief from the housing crisis we face. Where the right combination of will, financial resources and enthusiasm is present, affordable housing consistent with surrounding development is possible.



## II. JURISDICTIONS THAT RECEIVED THE SURVEY

### A. Alameda County

Cities:	Alameda	Newark
	*Albany	*Oakland
	*Berkeley	*Piedmont
	*Emeryville	*Pleasanton
	*Fremont	*San Leandro
	Hayward	*Union City
	*Livermore	

#### School Districts:

- \*Alameda Unified, Alameda
- \*Albany Unified, Albany
- Berkeley Unified, Berkeley
- \*Castro Valley Unified, Castro Valley
- \*Emeryville Unified, Emeryville
- \*Fremont Unified, Fremont
- \*Hayward Unified, Hayward
- \*Livermore Unified, Livermore
- \*Newark Unified, Newark
- \*Oakland Unified, Oakland
- \*Piedmont Unified, Oakland
- \*San Leandro Unified, San Leandro
- \*San Lorenzo Unified, San Lorenzo
- \*Mountain House Elementary, Byron
- \*Murray Elementary, Dublin
- \*Pleasanton Joint Elementary, Pleasanton
- \*Sunol Glen Elementary, Sunol
- \*Amador Valley High School District, Pleasanton
- \*Fremont-Newark Community College District, Fremont
- Peralta Community College District, Oakland,
- \*South County Community College District, Hayward

### B. Contra Costa County

Cities:	*Antioch	*Moraga
	*Brentwood	Pinole
	*Clayton	*Pittsburg
	*Concord	*Pleasant Hill
	*El Cerrito	Richmond
	*Hercules	*San Pablo
	*Lafayette	*Walnut Creek
	*Martinez	

\*Asterick shows jurisdictions that replied to the survey

School Districts:

- \*Antioch Unified, Antioch
- \*Brentwood Union, Brentwood
- Byron Union, Byron
- Canyon Unified, Canyon
- John Swett Unified, Crockett
- Knightsen Unified, Knightsen
- \*Lafayette Unified, Lafayette
- \*Martinez Unified, Martinez
- \*Moraga Unified, Moraga
- \*Mt. Diablo Unified, Concord
- Oakley Union, Oakley
- \*Orinda Union, Orinda
- \*Pittsburg Unified, Pittsburg
- \*Richmond Unified, Richmond
- San Ramon Valley Unified, Danville
- \*Walnut Creek Unified, Walnut Creek
- \*Acalanes Union High School District, Lafayette
- Liberty Union High School District, Brentwood
- Contra Costa Community College District, Martinez

C. Marin County

Cities:

*Belvedere	*Ross
*Corte Madera	*San Anselmo
*Fairfax	*San Rafael
*Larkspur	*Sausalito
*Mill Valley	*Tiburon
*Novato	

School Districts:

- Bolinas-Stinson Elementary, Bolinas
- \*Dixie Elementary, San Rafael
- \*Fairfax Elementary, Fairfax
- \*Kentfield Elementary, Kentfield
- Lagunitas Elementary, San Geronimo
- \*Larkspur Elementary, Larkspur
- \*Mill Valley Elementary, Mill Valley
- \*Novato Unified, Novato
- \*Reed Union Elementary, Corte Madera
- Ross Elementary, Ross
- \*San Anselmo Elementary, San Anselmo
- \*San Rafael Elementary, San Rafael
- Sausalito Elementary, Sausalito
- Shoreline Unified, Tomales
- \*San Rafael Unified High School District, San Rafael
- Shoreline Unified High School District, Tomales
- \*Tamalpais Union High School District, Larkspur
- \*Marin Community College District, Kentfield

D. Napa County

Cities:           Calistoga                   \*St. Helena  
                  \*Napa                    \*Yountville

School Districts:

\*Calistoga Joint Unified, Calistoga  
\*Napa Joint Community College, Napa  
\*Napa Valley Unified, Napa  
  St. Helena Unified, St. Helena  
\*Napa County Superintendent of Schools, Napa

E. San Francisco County

City:            \*San Francisco

School District:

\*San Francisco Unified

F. San Mateo County

Cities:           \*Atherton                   \*Millbrae  
                  \*Belmont                \*Pacifica  
                  \*Brisbane               \*Portola Valley  
                  \*Burlingame            \*Redwood City  
                  \*Colma                  San Bruno  
                  \*Daly City             \*San Carlos  
                  \*Foster City           \*San Mateo  
                  \*Half Moon Bay        South San Francisco  
                  \*Hillsborough        \*Woodside  
                  Menlo Park

School Districts:

\*Bayshore Elementary, Daly City  
\*Belmont Elementary, Belmont  
\*Brisbane Elementary, Brisbane  
\*Burlingame Elementary, Burlingame  
\*Cabrillo Unified, Half Moon Bay  
\*Hillsborough City Elementary, Hillsborough  
\*Jefferson Union High School District, Daly City  
\*Laguna Salada Union Elementary, Pacifica  
\*La Honda-Pescadero Unified, Pescadero  
\*Las Lomitas Elementary, Menlo Park  
\*Menlo Park City Elementary, Menlo Park  
\*Millbrae Elementary, Millbrae  
\*Portola Valley Elementary, Portola Valley  
  Ravenswood City Elementary, East Palo Alto  
\*Redwood City Elementary, Redwood City

San Bruno Park Elementary, San Bruno  
 \*San Carlos Elementary, San Carlos  
 \*San Mateo City Elementary, San Mateo  
 \*San Mateo Community College District, San Mateo  
 \*San Mateo Union High School District, San Mateo  
 \*Sequoia Union High School District, Redwood City  
 \*South San Francisco Unified, South San Francisco  
 \*Woodside Elementary, Woodside

# Santa Clara County

Cities:	*Campbell	*Morgan Hill
	*Cupertino	*Mountain View
	*Gilroy	*Palo Alto
	Los Altos	*San Jose
	*Los Altos Hills	*Santa Clara
	*Los Gatos	*Saratoga
	*Milpitas	*Sunnyvale
	Monte Sereno	

## School Districts:

\*Alum Rock Union Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Berryessa Union Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Cambrian Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Campbell Union Elementary, Campbell  
 \*Cupertino Union Elementary, Campbell  
 \*Evergreen Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Franklin-McKinley Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Lakeside Joint Elementary, Los Gatos  
 \*Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary, Los Gatos  
 \*Los Gatos Union Elementary, Los Gatos  
 \*Luther Burbank Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Montebello Elementary, Cupertino  
 \*Moreland Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Mountain View Elementary, Mountain View  
 Mount Pleasant Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Oak Grove Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Orchard Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Saratoga Union Elementary, Saratoga  
 \*Sunnyvale Elementary, Sunnyvale  
 \*Union Elementary, San Jose  
 \*Whisman Elementary, Mountain View  
 \*Campbell Union High School District, San Jose  
 \*Eastside Union High School District, San Jose  
 \*Fremont Union High School District, Sunnyvale  
 Los Gatos Joint Union High School District,  
 Los Gatos  
 \*Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District,  
 Mountain View  
 \*Gilroy Unified, Gilroy



- \*Milpitas Unified, Milpitas
- \*Palo Alto Unified, Palo Alto
- \*San Jose Unified, San Jose
- \*Santa Clara Unified, Santa Clara
- Foothill-De-Anza Community College District,  
Los Altos Hills
- \*Gavilan Joint Community College District, San Jose
- San Jose Community College District, San Jose
- West Valley Community College District, Saratoga

#### H. Solano County

Cities:	Benicia	*Suisun City
	Dixon	*Vacaville
	*Fairfield	Vallejo
	Rio Vista	

#### School Districts:

- \*Benicia Unified, Benicia
- \*Dixon Unified, Dixon
- \*Fairfield-Suisun Unified, Fairfield
- Travis Unified, Travis AFB
- \*Vacaville Unified, Vacaville
- \*Vallejo Unified, Vallejo
- \*Solano Community College District, Suisun

#### I. Sonoma County

Cities:	Cloverdale	*Rohnert Park
	Cotati	Santa Rosa
	Healdsburg	*Sebastopol
	*Petaluma	Sonoma

#### School Districts:

- \*Analy Union High School District, Sebastopol
- \*Bellevue Union, Santa Rosa
- \*Bennett Valley Union, Santa Rosa
- \*Cinnabar, Petaluma
- \*Cloverdale Unified, Cloverdale
- \*Cotati-Rohnert Park, Rohnert Park
- Healdsburg Union High School District, Healdsburg
- \*Mark West Union, Santa Rosa
- Oak Grove Union, Sebastopol
- \*Old Adobe Union, Petaluma
- \*Rincon Valley Union, Santa Rosa
- \*Roseland, Sebastopol
- \*Santa Rosa City High School District, Santa Rosa
- \*Sonoma Valley Unified, Sonoma
- Sonoma County Junior College District, Santa Rosa

### III. JURISDICTIONS THAT CONTAIN AVAILABLE SURPLUS LAND

In this section, parcels that are marked by the double asteriks (\*\*) are surplus sites which have been identified by the responding jurisdictions and school districts as having potential for developing affordable housing. These sites have been evaluated by the jurisdictions and the ABAG Housing Staff. These sites have the most potential of being developed for affordable housing.

The criteria for deciding whether a site does have potential to be developed for affordable housing depend upon: (1) each jurisdictions assessment of the sites availability and suitability for residential development; and (2) whether the site meets HUD's housing requirements for site selection. Appendix C provides the basis for HUD requirements. The criteria are based solely on the responding jurisdiction assessment of the site and comparing it to HUD requirements. HUD did not declare the sites developable by their own judgment.



## ALAMEDA COUNTY

# A. ALAMEDA COUNTY

## Cities:

### City of Berkeley

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	1317-19 Shattuck	.358	R-2	Residential	Unknown	Residential	Sell
**2.	1322 Walnut	.119	R-2	"	"	Residential	Sell
3.	Marin near Cragmont	.114	R-1	"	"	Vacant	Sell/Trade
**4.	1812 Fairview	.149	R-2	"	"	Residential	Housing
5.	3016 Harper	.110	R-2	"	"	"	"
**6.	1521 Alcatraz	.164	R-2	"	"	"	"
**7.	1607 Stuart	.154	R-2	"	"	"	"
8.	1350 Sacramento	.114	R-1	"	"	"	Sell
**9.	1430, 32,34 Hopkins	.143	R-2	"	"	"	Sell
**10.	1442 Hopkins	.143	R-2	"	"	"	Sell
**11.	1631 Prince	.154	R-2	"	"	"	Park
**12.	S.E. Corner of Adeline and Fairview	.375	C-1	Res/Comm'l	"	Unknown	Com. Center
**13.	Santa Fe Right-of-Way	11.6	Varied	Varied	"	Railroad Right-of-Way	Open Space/ Housing

### City of Fremont

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	525-977-71	.183	R-1-6	Residential	\$16,000	Unknown	None
2.	525-977-2	.220	R-1-6	"	\$19,200	"	"
3.	543-300-7	.026	R-1-6	"	\$ 4,620	"	"

### City of Livermore

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Southwest Corner of Raymond and Ames	190	A	Farming	Unknown	City Dump	Open Space
2.	Southeast Corner of I-580 and Airway	21	I-1	Industrial	"	None	Industrial
3.	Southeast Corner of Chestnut & Livermore	.5	CG RM	Commercial Apartments	"	Residential	None



### City of Pleasanton

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1:	Palomino at Touriga	.5	RM2	Residential	None	Vacant	Unknown
**2.	Bernal Ave.	2.5	C	Offices Commercial	Unknown	Civic Center	None
**3.	Stoneridge Drive	18.0	AG	Agricultural Residential	"	Vacant	Public Use
**4.	Sunol Blvd	2.5	I	Commercial Industrial	"	Sewage Treat. Corp. Yard	None

### City of San Leandro

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	1203 Gardner Blvd.	.126	R-1	Single Family	\$60,000	Library	Single Family
**2.	507-09 Castro	.206	R-5	Multi Family	Unknown	Residential	Low Density
**3.	477 Harlan	.170	R-5	"	"	"	"

### SCHOOL DISTRICTS

#### Alameda Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.-	400 Grand Avenue, Alameda	1.0	R-1	Residential	\$450,000	District Office	None

# Fremont Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Alviso School, 34150 Fremont Blvd.	9.0	Inst.	Recreation/ Community Use	\$ 450,000	School	Unknown
**2.	Marshall School, 5301 Curtis	10.0	R	"	\$ 500,000	School	"
**3.	Niles High School, Walnut Way	38.6	Agri.	Agriculture	\$1,930,000	Agriculture	"
**4.	Olivos de Guadalupe, 611 Olive Avenue	10.0	R	Recreation/ Community Use	\$ 500,000	School	"
**5.	Rix Elementary, 43100 Isle Royal	10.3	R	"	\$ 501,500	School	"
**6.	Robertson Jr. High, 4455 Seneca Park	23.6	R	"	\$1,180,000	School	"

# Hayward Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Kimball School, 1130 Kimball Ave.	6.0	R-5	Single Family	\$1,280,000	School	Sell

# Livermore Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Alameda Drive Site	10.0	R	Unknown	Unknown	School	Unknown
**2.	685 Las Positas Blvd.	15.0	E	"	"	Open	Unknown

Murray School District, Dublin

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	941-1401-1402	9.97	M-1	Lt. Ind.	\$1,100,000	Vacant	Sell
**2.	941-99-4-1	26.95	Unknown	School/Park	\$2,156,240	Vacant	Sell
**3.	941-10504-23	11.87	"	"	\$ 949,600	"	Sell

Newark Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	F.A. Muller School, Cherry Street	7.8	R-6000	S.F. Resid.	Unknown	School	Sell

Oakland Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	North Oak Knoll, Skyline Blvd. near Grass Valley Road	10.1	R-20	Low Density Residential, Comm. Service	\$110,000	None	Sell or Exchange
**2.	Clawson School Site, 3240 Peralta Street	3.0	R-40	Garden Apt. Residential, Comm. Service	Not Valued	Elementary School	Sell Site
**3.	Willow Manor School Site, 15th and Campbell	1.4	R-40	Residential, Comm. Service	\$ 65,000	"	"
** 4.	Grove Street Campus, Old Building & Grounds only at this time (Phase I)	9.0	R-40	Residential, Comm. Service	\$153,000	High School and Community College	To be Sold to City of Oakland

Pleasanton Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Crellin Road Site	18	Unknown	Residential	Unknown	School	Sell
**2.	Black Avenue Site	6	"	"	"	School	Sell
**3.	Sycamore Road Site	40	Agri.	Agri./Res.	\$280,000	School	Sell

San Lorenzo Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Ashland School, 16485 E. 14th Street San Leandro, CA 94578	8.5	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Elementary School	Sell
**2.	Fairmont School, 1785 150th Street San Leandro, CA 94578	5.9	"	"	"	Elementary School	Sell

State Owned Surplus Lands in Alameda County

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	23826 Madeiros Avenue, Hayward	.457	Res.	Residential	\$ 27,000	Improved Residential	Hold
**2.	2532 "D" Street, Hayward	.775	"	"	"	"	"
**3.	2880 Kelly Street, Hayward	.191	"	"	\$ 33,500	"	Sell
**4.	2080 East Avenue, Hayward	.149	"	"	\$ 25,000	"	"
**5.	2870 Kelly Street, Hayward	.395	"	"	\$ 22,800	"	"
6.	#036428-01-01 Hayward	.378	"	"	\$ 30,000	"	"
**7.	2nd St. & Patricia Court, Hayward	4.1	"	"	\$ 6,720	Vacant	"
**8.	1407 Highland Blvd., Hayward	.150	"	"	\$110,890	Improved Residential	"
**9.	1473 Highland Blvd., Hayward	.177	"	"	\$ 19,500	"	"
**10.	3371 E. Castro Valley Road, Hayward	.116	"	"	\$ 23,000	"	"
**11.	1441 Highland Blvd., Hayward	.135	"	"	\$ 73,400	"	"



# State Owned Surplus Lands in Alameda County (Continued)

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
12.	24679 Second Street, Hayward	.138	Res.	Residential	\$ 17,042	Improved Residential	Sell
13.	2533 D Street, Hayward	.325	"	"	\$ 32,500	"	"
14.	Sparks Way and Nulla Way, Hayward	4.62	"	"	\$130,000	"	"
**15.	Southerly Corner of Esteban & 173rd Avenue, Hayward	.184	"	"	\$ 27,028	Vacant	"
**16.	N/W Quadrant Route 580 & Eden Canyon Road, Hayward	1.786	Agr.	Agriculture	\$ 46,956	"	"
**17.	4164-4168 Toyon Place, Castro Valley	.239	Res.	Residential	\$ 24,571	Residential	"
**18.	2274-2294 Lobert, Castro Valley	.364	"	"	\$ 55,507	Vacant	"
**19.	Westerly Corner of Mattox Road and Marion Street, Hayward	.251	"	"	\$ 27,491	"	"
20.	Northerly of Interstate 580. Westerly of Crow Canyon Road, Castro Valley	2.202	"	"	Unknown	"	"
21.	South of Interstate 580 & West of Eden Canyon Rd., Dublin	19.300	"	"	\$ 13,151	"	"
**22.	North Side of Locust Street & Mattox Road, Hayward	.239	"	"	\$ 11,501	"	"
**23.	3476 E. Castro Valley Blvd., 4471 Crow Canyon Road, Castro Valley	1.450	"	"	\$ 76,086	"	"



CONTRA COSTA

COUNTY

**B. CONTRA COSTA COUNTY****Cities:****City of Antioch**

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Lone Tree Way Site	1.5	R-3	Open Space	Unknown	Open Space	None

**City of Walnut Creek**

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	AP 140-241-002 Corner of La Casa via and Montego, Walnut Creek	3.65	C-0	Commercial, Business, Professional Housing	\$550,000	Vacant	Develop

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS****Acalanes Union High School District, Lafayette**

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Campolindo Site, Moraga Road and Campolindo Drive, Moraga	8.22	R-10	Single Family Residence	\$ 300,000	Open Space	Sell/ Residential
2.	Del Valle Site, Walnut Creek	51.24	P.D.	School, Single Family Residence, Senior Citizens	\$3,250,000	High School	Lease
3.	Bear Creek Site Bear Creek Road, Orinda	42.51	A-2	Agriculture 5 acre min.	\$ 255,000	Grazing Land	Lease/Sell

### Martinez Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Bounded by Howe, Armond Road and Morello	62	R-5	School	\$1,800,000	Farmland	Sell
2.	Corner of Bear Creek Road and Alhambra Valley Road	.5	Unknown	"	\$ 5,000	School	Sell
3.	Alhambra Valley Road and Reliez Road	12.5	R-1	Housing	\$ 250,000	Farmland School	Sell
**4.	3930 Pacheco Blvd.	2.0	Ind.	Ind.	Unknown	Warehouse	Sell

### Pleasanton Joint Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Sycamore Road Site, 876 Sycamore	40	Agri.	Agriculture	\$280,000	Vacant	Sell

### State Owned Surplus Lands in Contra Costa County

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Between Camino Ricardo and Moraga Road, Moraga	18.7	Res.	Residential	\$185,906	Vacant	Sell
**2.	West side of St. Mary's Road at South Lucille Lane, Lafayette	3.0	"	"	\$ 29,966	Vacant	Sell
**3.	Westside St. Mary's Road at Bollinger Canyon Road, Moraga	5.0	"	"	\$ 49,808	"	"
**4.	Eastside of Bollinger Canyon Road at St. Mary's Road, Moraga	1.0	"	"	\$ 10,541	"	"



# State Owned Surplus Lands in Contra Costa County (Continued)

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**5.	Eastside of St. Mary's Road, North of Rohrer Drive, Lafayette	57.6	Res.	Residential	\$579,940	Vacant	Sell
**6.	Eastside of Moraga Road, North of St. Mary's Road, Moraga	20.0	"	"	\$199,222	"	"
**7.	Eastside of Reliez Station Road at Michael Lane, Lafayette	62.8	"	"	\$292,345	"	"
**8.	Pleasant Hill Road and Bradena Lane, Lafayette	.822	"	"	\$ 10,442	"	"
9.	Pinehurst Rd, 7 miles west of Canyon Post Office, Contra Costa County	15.0	"	"	\$526,500	"	"
**10.	Westside of St. Mary's Road Between Rheem Blvd. and Rohrer Drive, Moraga/Lafayette	48.5	"	"	\$250,000	"	"
**11.	Between Burton Drive and Michael Lane, Lafayette	9.7	"	"	\$196,515	"	"
**12.	1/4 mile west of Dolores Way to Moraga Way, Moraga	93.0	"	"	\$795,740	"	"
**13.	Between Camino Ricardo and Moraga Way, Moraga	11.4	"	"	\$113,489	"	"
**14.	Northeast corner of 50th & Montgomery Street, Richmond	.241	"	"	\$ 15,242	"	"

State Owned Surplus Lands in Contra Costa County (Continued)

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**15.	Northwest corner of of Washington and Standard Avenues, Richmond	.128	Com.	Commercial	\$ 15,340	Vacant	Sell
16.	Southside of Arnold Industrial Highway and Solano Way, Concord	1.75	Ind.	Res./Ind.	\$ 60,263	"	"
17.	Southside of Frontage Road, 1/2 mile east of Willow Pass Road, Concord	5.0	Agr.	Agriculture	\$ 75,250	"	"
**18.	East Side of I-680, South of Stone Valley Road, Alamo	6.5	Res.	Residential	\$ 21,383	"	"



## MARIN COUNTY

C. MARIN COUNTY

Cities:

City of Mill Valley

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Parcel 29-290-01 Greenwood Way	1.0	R-1	Single Family Homes	\$80,000	Undeveloped	Sell

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Fairfax Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	58 Park Road, Fairfax	.25	R-3	Multiple Dwelling/ Warehouse	\$90,000	School District Office Site with 3,000 sq. ft. warehouse	District currently selling property

Mill Valley Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	100 Harvard Ave.	8.2	R-1 B-1	Housing School	Unknown	School	Unknown



Novato Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Northwest of Bugeia Lane & Atherton Avenue, Novato	9.81	AZ	Unknown	\$ 225,000	None	Sold
**2.	720 Ignacio Blvd., Novato	10.29	R3	"	\$1,500,000	Elementary School	Being Sold
**3.	Southwest of Marion Avenue & 7th Street, Novato	13.90	AZ	"	\$4,000,000	Elementary School	City Negotiating For Use

Reed Union Elementary School District, Corda Madera

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Redwood School, Tiburon	22.0	R-1 B-2	Residential, Non- Commercial	Unknown	School	Lease
**2.	Paradise Site, Tiburon	9.82	R-1	Residential	\$800,000	Undeveloped	Sell

San Anselmo Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Sleepy Hollow School	Unknown	R-1 B-D	Residential, Recreational	\$325,000	School	Lease/Sell

San Rafael City School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	West End School, 5th Avenue	2.55	R-2	Residential	\$ 59,500	School	Elderly Housing
**2.	John McPhail School	9.74	A-2	School/ Housing	\$590,000	School	Sell

# State Owned Surplus Lands in Marin County

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Southwest Quadrant of Atherton Avenue and Highway 101, Novato	1.809	Comm'l	Commercial	\$8,203	Vacant	Sell
**2.	Shoreline Highway Opposite Tomales Street, Mill Valley	.266	Comm'l	Commercial	\$1,500	Vacant	Sell



## NAPA COUNTY

**D. NAPA COUNTY**

**Cities:**

**City of St. Helena**

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	AP9-03-19 Hunt Street	5.02	A-5 A-SFLP R1	Agricultural, Unknown Single-Family Residential		Sewer Treatment Plant	Low Density Residential

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS: No Surplus Land Available**

**State Owned Surplus Lands in Napa County**

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Eastside of Highway 29, Opposite Old Soscol Road, Napa Rd, Napa	1.83	R-1	Residential	Unknown	Unknown	Sell
**2.	567 Lincoln Avenue, Napa	1.66	Indus.	Industrial or Residential	"	Residential	Sell
**3.	East of Highway 29 at Watson Lane East of Frontage Road, Napa	1.83	R-1 B-1	Residential	"	Vacant	Sell





SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

# E. SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

City:

City of San Francisco

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Bryant Street and and 4th Street	1.4	P M-2	Public Use, Industrial	\$ 600,000	Storage	Sell in 2 Years
**2.	Southwest Corner Felton and Bowdoin Streets	2.2	P	Residential, Public Use	\$1,100,000	Storage	Sell in 2 Years
**3.	Wisconsin Street Site bounded by 26th., De Haro and 23rd Street	10.099	RH-2 P	Residential, Public Use	Unknown	Vacant Housing Project	Low and Moderate Housing, Open Space

## SCHOOL DISTRICT

San Francisco Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Madison Elementary School, 3941 Clay Street	.99	P	Public Use, Residential	Unknown	School	Lease, Subject to Approval of Board of Education
**2.	Grant School Site, 2940 Pacific Avenue	1.1	P	Public Use, Residential Planned Unit Development	"	School	"
**3.	Corbett Elementary School, 500 Corbett Street	.66	R-3	Residential	"	School District Offices	"
**4.	Gough School, 1945 Washington Street	.40	P	Public Use, Residential, RM-3	"	"	"
**5.	Marshall Annex, 1950 Mission Street	.83	P	Public Use, C-2/RM-2/ RM-3	"	School	"

San Francisco Unified School District (Continued)

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**6.	Candlestick Cove School, 120 Street	.96	P	Public Use, RH-2	Unknown	School	Lease Subject to Approval of Board of Education
**7.	Sunset Staging Site, 3746 Ulloa	1.8	P	Public Use, RH-2/PUD	"	Vacant	"
**8.	Portola Junior High School, 350 Girard Street	4.9	P	Public Use, PUD	"	Vacant With District Offices	"
**9.	Herbert Hoover, Vacant Land, Rivera and Funston Avenue	.5	P	Public Use, RH-2/RH-3	"	Vacant	"
**10.	Lucinda Weeks Site 750 31st Avenue	.82	P	Public Use RH-3/PUD	"	School District Offices	"
**11.	Polytechnic High School, 701 Frederick Street	3.2	P	Public Use, RH-3/PUD	"	Vacant	"

**SPECIAL DISTRICT**

Bay Area Rapid Transit District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Northwest Corner of Head Street and DeLong Street, San Francisco	.15	P	Public Use RH-1	Unknown	Vacant	Sale by Public Auction to Highest Bidder
**2.	Southerly Corner of DeLong Street Street and Santa Cruz Avenue, San Francisco	.37	P	Public Use, RH-1	"	Vacant	"

**State Surplus Lands in San Francisco County: None Available**



## SAN MATEO COUNTY



## F. SAN MATEO COUNTY

### Cities:

#### City of Portola Valley

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	APN 076-181-150	2.04	RH-1	Residential	Unknown	Vacant	Vacant
2.	076-181-160	2.06	"	"	"	"	"
3.	076-184-030	.98	"	"	"	"	"
4.	076-192-130	.25	"	"	"	"	"
5.	076-244-020	1.28	"	"	"	"	"

#### City of Redwood City

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Edgewood Road Site North I-280	300	PF	Public Use	\$2,000,000	None	Park-Open Space

#### City of San Mateo

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	330 W. 20th Ave., #039-023-500	1.3	E-1	Administrative Offices	\$155,000	None	Unknown
2.	Pacific Blvd. & Laurie Meadows Drive #040-234-140	3	C1-1	Commercial	\$188,000	None	Unknown

#### County of San Mateo

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	AP #37-291-01 Coast Highway, Montara	6.7	R-M	Low Density, Residential	Unknown	Grazing	Possible Low Cost Housing Development

## SCHOOL DISTRICTS

### Brisbane Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	San Bruno Mountain, Crocker Hill Site in Daly City/ Brisbane	17.8	S-10	Open	Unknown	Vacant School Site	Possibly Sell

### Burlingame Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Pershing School Site, 1560 Newland Avenue	7.8	R-1	Residential	Unknown	School Site	Lease
**2.	Hoover School Site	6.7	R-1	Residential	Unknown	School Site	Lease

### Jefferson School District, Daly City

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Olympia School 200 Northgate, Daly City	3.1	R-1	Residential	\$800,000	Elementary School	Sell
**2.	Vista Grande School 50 South Florence Avenue, Daly City	3.83	R-1	Residential	\$600,000	Elementary School	Sell or Lease

### Redwood City School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Washington School Site, 485 Washington, Redwood City	4.6	C-3 R-3	Commercial Residential	\$850,000	School	Unknown

### San Mateo Union High School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Between Foster City Blvd., Hillsdale and Shell Blvd., Foster City	56	PF	Public Facility	\$1,000,000	None	None

### Sequoia Union High School District, Redwood City

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	East Palo Alto High School Site	29	R-1	Residential	\$3,000,000	High School	Sell
**2.	Sand Hill Road Site (Adjacent to Menlo Park)	40	RE-1	Residential	\$2,300,000	Open Space	Sell or Lease

### State Owned Surplus Lands in San Mateo County

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Shell Dance Nursery 2000 Cabrillo Hwy. Pacifica	12.591	Unclas- sified	Business, Residential	\$481,300	Residence and Nursery	Sell
**2.	Northline of San Bruno Avenue, Eastline of Glenview Drive, San Bruno	34.471	Open Space	Open Space	\$338,113	Vacant	Sell
3.	2322 Crestview Drive, San Bruno	1.292	Unclas- sified	School, Residential	\$ 35,108	Field of Elementary School	On Hold
4.	West Side of Glenview Drive, North of San Bruno Avenue	4.471	R-1	Residential	\$389,490	Vacant	Sell
**5.	2880 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno	.597	Comm'l	Commercial	\$389,490	Vacant	Sell

State Owned Surplus Lands in San Mateo County (Continued)

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**6.	2890 San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno	.479	Comm'l	Commercial	\$203,900	Gas Station	Sell
7.	NW Corner of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive, San Bruno	.575	Comm'l	Commercial	\$196,800	Materials Lab for Caltrans	Sell
**8.	Southeast Corner of Skyline Blvd. and San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno	0.19	Comm'l	Commercial	\$ 54,132	Vacant	Sell
**9.	500' Northernly of Crestmoor Drive, Opposite Trenton Drive, San Bruno	5.214	Unzoned	Unzoned	\$ 46,052	Vacant	Sell
**10.	900' Northernly of Crestmoor Drive, Opposite Trenton Drive, San Bruno	.897	Res.	Residential	\$ 13,796	Vacant	Sell
11.	Southwest quadrant of Intersection of Routes 35 and 1, Daly City	8.305	Res.	Residential	\$ 59,132	Vacant	Sell





## SANTA CLARA COUNTY

## G. SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Cities:

### City of Saratoga

Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1. S.E. Corner: Cox and Saratoga - Sunnyvale Road	2.75	R-1	Residential	\$500,000	Vacant	Assisted Housing Development

## SCHOOL DISTRICTS

### Alum Rock Union Elementary School District, San Jose

Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1. Madden Avenue Site	10.0	Agr. Res.	Residential	\$ 55,000	Agriculture	None

### Campbell Union Elementary School District

Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1. Cypress School, San Jose	10.3	PF	Residential School	Unknown	School	Sell/Lease
**2. Morepark School 649 Thornton Way San Jose	15	PF	"	"	"	"
**3. Parkway School 165 Saratoga Ave., Santa Clara	9.7	PF	"	"	"	"
**4. Guito School, San Jose	13.1	PF	"	"	"	"
**5. San Tomas School Site, Campbell	16.0	PF	"	"	"	"
**6. Sherman Oaks School, 180 Fruitvale Ave., San Jose	12.5	PF	"	"	"	"

Campbell Union High School District, San Jose

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	110 Campbell Avenue, Campbell	28.5	PF	Residential School	\$8,000,000	High School	Sell/Lease
**2.	2075 Camden Avenue, San Jose	33.8	PF	"	\$9,000,000	"	"

Cupertino Union School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Calabazas Creek School, 1455 Longfellow Way, San Jose	8.24	Unknown	School	\$2,472,000	School	Sell
**2.	San Antonio School, 11875 Wright Avenue, Sunnyvale	10.0	"	"	\$3,000,000	"	"
**3.	Sedgwick School, 10511 Tantau Avenue, Cupertino	10.0	"	"	\$3,000,000	"	Lease
**4.	Grant School, 1575 Holt Avenue, Los Altos	9.75	"	"	\$2,924,000	"	"
**5.	Hansen School, 12211 Titus Avenue, Saratoga	8.70	"	"	\$2,609,700	"	"
**6.	Inverness School, 747 Inverness Way, Sunnyvale	9.6	"	"	\$2,880,000	"	Sell
**7.	Panama School, 755 Dartshire Way, Sunnyvale	9.64	"	"	\$2,892,000	"	"

Fremont School District, Sunnyvale

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans	
**1.	Prospect Site on Prospect Road, Saratoga	48.0	R-2000	Housing	\$6,000,000	Field	Sell	**1

Los Altos Union Elementary School District, Los Altos

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans	
**1.	Eastbrook School, Eastbrook and Mora Roads, Los Altos	10.0	R-1	Pub. Facility, Single Family Residence	\$1,400,000	School	Sell	**1.
**2.	Covington School, 201 Covington Road, Los Altos	15.5	R-1	"	\$5,000,000	School	Lease	

Los Gatos Union Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans	
**1.	Berry School Site	12.5	Res.	Pub. Facility	\$4,800,000	School	Lease	**2

Moreland School District, San Jose

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans	
**1.	Strawberry Park School	12	PF	School	\$2,000,000	School	School or Sell	**5
**2.	Brookview School	12	"	"	\$3,000,000	"	"	**6
**3.	El Quito Park School	10	"	"	\$2,000,000	"	"	7
**4.	Bucknall School	12	"	"	\$2,500,000	"	"	**8
**5.	Coventry School	11	"	"	\$2,750,000	"	"	
**6.	Amber Drive School	12	"	"	\$4,200,000	"	"	



Mountain View Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
--	--	-----------------	--------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	-----------------

**1.	Sylvan School Site, Sylvan Avenue	9.5	PF	Public Use, Housing	\$1,980,000	School	Sell
------	--------------------------------------	-----	----	------------------------	-------------	--------	------

Oak Grove Elementary School District, San Jose

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
--	--	-----------------	--------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	-----------------

**1.	Corner of Cheynoweth and Edenvale Avenues	20.0	R-1 B-8	Unknown	\$1,500,000	Agricultural	Unknown
------	--	------	------------	---------	-------------	--------------	---------

Palo Alto Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
--	--	-----------------	--------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	-----------------

**1.	830 E. Meadow	6.0	PF	Residence, Pub. Facility, Community Center	\$1,800,000	School	Sell
------	---------------	-----	----	---	-------------	--------	------

**2.	3530 Ross Rd.	5.0	PF	"	\$ 1,500,000	"	Sell
------	---------------	-----	----	---	--------------	---	------

3.	26800 Ortega, Los Altos Hills	7.0	PF	"	\$ 1,800,000	"	Sell
----	----------------------------------	-----	----	---	--------------	---	------

**4.	3990 Ventura Court	4.6	PF	"	\$ 1,400,000	"	Sell
------	--------------------	-----	----	---	--------------	---	------

**5.	655 Arastradero	20.0	PF	"	\$ 6,300,000	"	Sell
------	-----------------	------	----	---	--------------	---	------

**6.	4000 Middlefield	35.0	PF	"	\$11,000,000	"	"
------	------------------	------	----	---	--------------	---	---

7.	Page Mill/Alexis Site	59.0	PF	"	\$5,000,000	"	"
----	-----------------------	------	----	---	-------------	---	---

**8.	Page Mill Arastradero Site	4.0	PF	"	\$ 800,000	"	Sell
------	-------------------------------	-----	----	---	------------	---	------

### Santa Clara Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Jefferson School, 3585 Monroe Street, Santa Clara	16.0	B	Public Use	\$4,000,000	School	Unknown
**2.	Bennett School, 1940 Halford Street, Santa Clara	9.2	B	"	\$2,500,000	"	Sell
					\$2,500,000	"	Unknown
**3.	Montgomery School, 890 Pepper Tree Lane, Santa Clara	9.4	B	"			
**4.	Curtis School 890 Pomeroy Avenue Santa Clara	8.0	B	"	\$2,100,000	"	"

### Saratoga Union Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	14675 Aloha Street Saratoga	1	R-1	3-15,000 sq. ft. lots	\$450,000	Orchard	None

### Sunnyvale Elementary School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Fair Oaks School, 725 N. Fair Oaks Avenue	10.0	PF	Res., School	\$2,300,000	School	Sell/Lease
**2.	Pippin School, 877 Pippin Street	9.0	PF	"	\$2,300,000	"	Unknown
**3.	Adair-Benner, 800 McKinley Avenue	20.0	PF	"	\$5,000,000	"	"
**4.	De Anza School, 1196 Lime Avenue	6.0	PF	"	\$2,000,000	"	"

# State Owned Surplus Lands in Santa Clara County

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Rear of 444 West Alma, San Jose	3.806	Comm'l	Commercial Uses	Unknown	Vacant	Possibly Sell
**2.	455 West Alma San Jose	5.930	Comm'l	Commercial Uses	Unknown	Golf Course	"
**3.	North of Highway 101, West of Thomas Road, Santa Clara	.231	Res.	Residential	\$30,201	Residential	"
**4.	Highway 680 Santa Clara- Milpitas Border	2.4	Agri.	Agricultural, Unknown Residential		Agricultural	"



## SOLANO COUNTY

## H. SOLANO COUNTY

### Cities:

#### City of Fairfield

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	1601 Enterprise	2.75	M-1	Light Industrial	\$ 175,000	Vacant	Sell
**2.	1000 Cement Hill Road	85.0	PD	Residential	\$3,000,000	Vacant	Sell

#### City of Suisun City

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1.	Pennsylvania and Cordelia Avenue	4.0	M-1	Light Industrial	\$20,000	Dump	Sell

## SCHOOL DISTRICTS

#### Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Crescent Elementary School, 400 Mulberry Street, Suisun	5.0	R-6	School, Residential	\$75,000	Part of Existing School	Pending
**2.	Tolenas Elementary School, Rt. 1, Box 161-A, Fairfield	5.0	"	"	\$75,000	"	"



# Vacaville Unified School District

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	Cora Black site, Parcel 132-040-09 and 11	7.69	R-M- 3000	12-14 units per acre	\$200,000	Empty Lot	Sell

## State Owned Surplus Lands in Solano County

	Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1.	North of Highway 37 between Mini Drive and College, Vallejo	1.66	R-5	Single Family	\$10,000	Vacant	Sell
2.	North of Highway 37 between Wilson and Rodgers Street, Vallejo	1.23	Not Zoned	None	\$1,500	Vacant	Sell



# SONOMA COUNTY

## **I. SONOMA COUNTY**

### Cities:

#### City of Sebastopol

Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
1. Morris Street	15	M	Manufacturing	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

#### City of Sonoma

Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1. 327 1st Street, West	.70	R-4	Housing	Unknown	City Corp. Yard	Sell

### SCHOOL DISTRICTS: No Surplus Parcels

#### State Owned Surplus Lands in Sonoma County

Location, Address and/or Tract Number	No. of Acres	Zoning	Permitted Uses	Market Value	Previous Use, If Any	Future Plans
**1. Southwest corner of Russell & Cleveland Avenues, Santa Rosa	1.389	Comm.	Commercial	\$41,570	Vacant	Sell
**2. East of NWPRR, 3000 Ft. South of Lake Street, Cloverdale	5.233	R-1	Residential, Agriculture	\$18,583	"	"

#### IV. LIST OF SITES THAT HAVE ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS AS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS

The following section lists sites that have environmental constraints. These development constraints have been identified by the jurisdictions that responded to the survey/questionnaire. Some of the constraints limit the development possibilities of the site; others constrain development of any type.

This listing is mainly provided to give the reader a general idea of environmental problems associated with a particular site. For a more detailed assessment, it is recommended that the reader contact the owner of the properties.

A. ALAMEDA COUNTY

Cities:

Berkeley

Site	Constraints
1. Marin near Cragmont	Alquist-Priolo Seismic Study Zone/Landslides

Livermore

Site	Constraints
1. Southwest corner of Raymond and Ames	Noise problems near railroad; problem with General Plan of City
2. Southeast corner of I-580 and Airway	"
3. Southeast corner of Chestnut and Livermore	"

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Fremont Unified School District

Site	Constraints
1. Niles High School site	Freeway designation



## Hayward Unified School District

Site	Constraints
1. Kimball School site, 1130 Kimball Avenue	Potential flood plain

### State Lands in Alameda County

Site	Constraints
1. #036428-01-01, City of Hayward	PG&E has utility easement over entire parcel
2. North of Interstate 580 and West of Crow Canyon Road, Castro Valley	Landlocked
3. South of I-580 and West of Eden Canyon Road, Dublin	Landlocked and steep

## B. CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

### Cities:

City of Antioch

Site	Constraints
1. Lone Tree Way site	Slope and shape (site 100x600)

### SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Acalanes Union High School District, Lafayette

Site	Constraints
1. Campolindo site	Steep hillside
2. Del Valle site	Surrounded by Rossmoor Leisure World
3. Bear Creek site	Adjacent to EBMUD reservoir, requires sewers

Martinez Unified School District

Site	Constraints
1. Alhambra Valley Road and Reliez Valley Road site	No sewers

Pleasanton Joint Elementary School District

Site	Constraints
1. Sycamore Road site	Possible flood run-off to surrounding areas

C. MARIN COUNTY

Cities:

City of Mill Valley

Site	Constraints
1. Parcel #29-290-01	Grading needed

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mill Valley Elementary School District

Site	Constraints
1. 100 Harvard Avenue	Slope requirements

Reed Union Elementary School District, Corte Madera

Site	Constraints
1. Redwood School, Tiburon	Slope constraints

San Rafael City School District

Site	Constraints
1. McPhail School	Fresh water marsh would have to be filled

State Lands in Marin County: No Development Constraints

D. NAPA COUNTY

Cities:

City of St. Helena

Site	Constraints
1. AP 9-03-19, Hunt Street site	Potential flood plain

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: No Surplus Land Available

State Lands in Napa County: No Development Constraints

E. SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

City:

San Francisco

Site	Constraints
1. Southwest corner of Felton and Bowdoin Streets	Land grading needed. Easement on Burrows Street needed. Easement for drainage needed. Surface drainage needed.

## SCHOOL DISTRICT

### San Francisco Unified School District

Site	Constraints
1. Gough School, 1945 Washington Street	Significant sloping

**State Lands in San Francisco County: No Surplus Sites Available**

## SPECIAL DISTRICTS IN SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

### Bay Area Rapid Transit District

Site	Constraints
1. Northwesterly corner of Head Street and DeLong Street, San Francisco	Steep downward slopes from DeLong Street

## F. SAN MATEO COUNTY

### Cities:

#### City of Portola Valley

Site	Constraints
1. Each site within a geologically unstable area	Subject to landsliding

City of Redwood City

Site	Constraints
1. Edgewood Road site, North of I-28	Remote, hilly, no sewer capacity, no public facilities

City of San Mateo

Site	Constraints
1. 330 W. 20th Avenue	Seismic activity and noise
2. Pacific Boulevard and Laurie along Meadows Drive	Seismic activity, flood plain noise

SCHOOL DISTRICT: No Sites have Constraints

State Owned Surplus Lands in San Mateo County

Site	Constraints
1. West Side of Glenview Drive, North of San Bruno Avenue, San Bruno	Possible earthquake fault
2. Southwest quadrant of intersection of Routes 35 and 1, Daly City	Soil unstable, geological hazard condition. Within coastal zone.

G. SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Cities:

City of Saratoga

Site	Constraints
1. Southeast corner Cox-Saratoga-Sunnyvale Road	Creek traversing site reduces developable land, but is not considered a flood hazard



## SCHOOL DISTRICTS

### Los Altos Elementary School District

Site	Constraints
1. Eastbrook School, Eastbrook and Mora Roads	Some slippage of filled land

### Palo Alto Unified School District

Site	Constraints
1. 26800 Ortega, Los Altos	Location in flood basin, slope requirements
2. Page Mill/Alexis site, Palo Alto	

### State Owned Lands in Santa Clara County

Site	Constraints
1. Rear of 444 West Alma, San Jose	No gas lines

## H. SOLANO COUNTY

### Cities:

#### City of Fairfield

Site	Constraints
1. 1000 Cement Hill Road	Flood protection to be provided by grading of area adjacent to Laurel

City of Suisun City

Site	Constraints
1. Pennsylvania and Cordelia	Adjacent to railroad, too noisy

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: No Surplus Sites Contain Constraints

State Owned Surplus Lands in Solano County

Site	Constraints
1. North of Highway 37 between Wilson and Rodgers Street, Vallejo	Area below high-tide

I. SONOMA COUNTY

Cities:

City of Sebastopol

Site	Constraints
1. Morris Street	Contain constraints

SCHOOL DISTRICTS: No Surplus Sites Contain Constraints

State Lands in Sonoma County: No Surplus Sites Contain Constraints

## VI. SUMMARY

This is the first in a series of three reports on surplus publicly owned lands in the San Francisco Bay Area. It is published as a unique source of information to those interested in surplus lands and their availability for development.

Most housing reports concentrate on analyzing and presenting information on where changes in the housing market have already occurred. This report and the continuing series of reports will investigate where future affordable housing may be developed.

In the Bay Area there are approximately 2,656 acres of surplus lands that have been accounted for in this working paper. These are not the only surplus publicly-owned parcels in the Bay Area. Many public agencies on the federal, state, county, city and school district levels are somewhat reluctant to give out information on the availability of surplus lands. Reasons for this reluctance can vary, but the three most prominent reasons are: 1) owner jurisdictions may have possible plans for their surplus lands; 2) local opposition to affordable housing developments; and 3) in order to make affordable housing developments feasible it may require a land write-down which a jurisdiction can not afford. It would be unwise to use this document as the sole resource for locating surplus publicly owned lands for affordable housing.

Of the approximately 2,656 acres of surplus land:

- 55% is owned by school districts
- 26% is owned by Bay Area Cities
- 19% is owned by the State of California

Surplus land creates an opportunity to use innovative techniques for the development of affordable housing. With housing prices in a constant upward spiral, more families are not in the position to buy homes. This includes low and moderate income families, the elderly, young couples, middle income people, and many first time buyers. Hopefully, these surplus lands will be put to use for the anticipated demand of smaller, higher density, lower cost affordable housing developments. We realize that there is a gap between developers and landowners coming together to reach a decision on how to solve the problem of buying and selling surplus properties. Before such agreement can become reality negotiating and compromising must take place.

In terms of creating housing opportunities for low and moderate income people, there are three major problems that must be overcome.

- 1) Neighborhood Opposition
- 2) Lack of Financial Resources
- 3) Differences Between Buyers and Sellers

These three problems persist because there is a lack of knowledge and understanding as to how they can be addressed. The need to create a program that could utilize both large and small parcels of surplus land, while finding outlets to overcome the above mentioned problems, will be the focus of the second working paper. It will try to determine the extent of possibilities of cooperation between public and private entities, and the need for their partnership to produce more affordable housing.

The second working paper will largely be based on interviews held with representatives from the public and private sectors. These include:

<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Housing Advocates	Banks
Elected officials	Savings and Loans
Planners	Real Estate Companies
Legal Aid Societies	Builders/Developers
Fair Housing Boards	Homeowners Associations

The second working paper will identify areas of possible agreement so as to facilitate the building of both a political constituency and additional affordable housing units for low and moderate income people.

## APPENDICES

I, II, III





2. Do any of the identified sites have any environmental residential development constraints, such as slope requirements, flood plains, etc.? If so, please list.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Constraint</u>

3. If the location of any of these sites prevents residential development, is it possible to sell or trade any of the surplus sites for land which could be used for residential development?

4. If known, are there other parcels of land which might be deemed surplus and for sale during the next three years?

If so, could you provide the general location of the parcel(s) along with a brief description, including the size.

5. What is the potential for any of the surplus sites identified to be developed for low and moderate income housing?
6. What kinds of community restraints and/or neighborhood opposition might need to be overcome if affordable (i.e., low and moderate income) housing were proposed on one or any identified surplus sites?

- (See attachment on HUD requirements on site selection.)

Location	Suitable for residential development as deemed by your jurisdiction			Meets HUD's requirements		
	YES	NO	OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	YES	NO	OTHER CONSID.



## DEFINITIONS

### Surplus Land:

Land which currently has no active use; land that is currently in excess. Land or sites that may become excess in the future. Land or sites which have no definite plans for use in the future.

### Low and Moderate Income Housing:

Low income housing is housing that is developed for people whose incomes do not exceed 80% of the median income for the market area. Moderate income housing is housing developed for people whose incomes are 80%-120% of that of median income for the market area.

## APPENDIX II

### ZONING DEFINITIONS

The following zoning listings are not specific to any particular city or county. This list is a generalization made to give the reader an idea of how each zoning term may be defined.

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>USE</u>
R-1	One-Family Dwellings - Parks, playgrounds, schools, community centers, libraries, churches, agriculture.
R-2	One-Family Dwellings - Uses permitted in "R-1" Districts, Home occupations, colleges, universities.
R-3	Two and Three Family Dwellings - Uses permitted in "R-2" Districts.
R-4-L	Multiple-Family Dwellings - Uses permitted in "R-3" Districts. Mobile home parks with Special Use Permit on 3-1/2 acre site.
R-4	Multiple-Family Dwellings - Uses permitted in "R-3" Districts. Boarding houses, private schools, fraternities, hospitals, institutions.
PRD	Planned Residential Development. Also townhouses and condominiums.
R-5	Multiple-Family Dwellings - Uses permitted in "R-4" Districts. Hotels and apartment hotels.
T	Office and Institutional
T-M	Medical Center
C-F	Freeway Commercial Uses - On a Freeway Frontage Road.
C-P	Planned Shopping Center - On limited sized sales.
C-1	Commercial - Uses permitted in "R-5" Districts, commercial uses necessary to a neighborhood.
C-2	Commercial - Uses permitted in "C-1" District, Retail stores and shops.
C-3	Commercial - Uses permitted in "C-2" Commercial District.
B	Business - Uses permitted in "C-2" Commercial District, and certain light industries that are not objectionable.

M-1	Light Industrial - Uses permitted in "C-2" District and industries not objectionable because of smoke, dust, odor, noise.
M-2	Heavy Industrial - Uses permitted in "M-1" District, Heavy industries except noxious, very noisy or dangerous industries.
M-3	Heavy Industrial - Uses permitted in "M-2" District, and any other use not excluded.
R-P	Research Park - Research and experimental laboratory uses, offices.
A/Ag	Agricultural or Farming Use
I	Industrial
C	Commercial
PUD	Planned Unit Development
PF	Public Facility, School, Community Center, Church

## APPENDIX III

### HUD SITE REQUIREMENTS

Proposed sites for new federally assisted construction projects must be approved by HUD as meeting the following standards:

(a) The site must be adequate in size, exposure and contour to accommodate the number and type of units proposed; and adequate utilities (water, sewer, gas and electricity) and streets must be available to service the site.

(b) The site and neighborhood must be suitable from the standpoint of facilitating and furthering full compliance with the applicable provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Executive Order 11063, and HUD regulations issued pursuant thereto.

(c) The site must not be located in:

(1) An area of minority concentration unless (i) sufficient, comparable opportunities exist for housing for minority families, in the income range to be served by the proposed project, outside areas of minority concentration, or (ii) the project is necessary to meet overriding housing needs which cannot otherwise feasibly be met in that housing market area. An "overriding need" may not serve as the basis for determining that a site is acceptable if the only reason the need cannot otherwise feasibly be met is that discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, creed, sex, or national origin renders sites outside areas of minority concentration unavailable; or

(2) A racially mixed area if the project will cause a significant increase in the proportion of minority to non-minority residents in the area.

(d) The site must promote greater choice of housing opportunities and avoid undue concentration of assisted persons in areas containing a high proportion of low-income persons.

(e) The site must be free from adverse environmental conditions, natural or manmade such as instability, flooding, septic tank back-ups, sewage hazards, or mudslides, harmful air pollution, smoke or dust, excessive noise vibration or vehicular traffic, rodent or vermin infestation, or fire hazards. The neighborhood must not be one which is seriously detrimental to family life or in which substandard dwellings or other undesirable elements predominate, unless there is actively in progress a concerted program to remedy the undesirable conditions.

(f) The site must comply with any applicable conditions in the local Housing Assistance Plan approved by HUD.

(g) The housing must be accessible to social, recreational, educational, commercial, and health facilities and services, and other municipal facilities and services that are at least equivalent to those typically found in neighborhoods consisting largely of unassisted, standard housing of similar market rents.

(h) Travel time and cost via public transportation or private automobile, from the neighborhood to places of employment providing a range of jobs for lower-income workers, must not be excessive. (While it is important that elderly housing not be totally isolated from employment opportunities, this requirement need not be adhered to rigidly for such projects.)

(i) The project may not be built on a site that has occupants unless the relocation requirements referred to in § 880.209 are met.

(j) The project may not be built in an area that has been identified by HUD as having special flood hazards and in which the sale of flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, unless the project is covered by flood insurance as required by the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, and it meets any relevant HUD standards and local requirements.



## APPENDIX B

### PERSONS INTERVIEWED

#### ELECTED OFFICIALS

Arlen Gregorio, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors  
Erwin Farley, Belvedere City Council

#### SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICIALS

Harold Bush, Assistant Superintendent, Vacaville Unified School District  
Carl Thorstead, Deputy Superintendent, Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District  
Donald Callajon, Deputy Superintendent, Santa Clara Unified School District  
Jerry Gill, Assistant Superintendent, San Rafael Unified School District  
Robert Long, Coordinator of Facilities Planning, Oakland Unified School District  
Michael Sorgen, Attorney, Oakland Unified School District

#### PLANNING OFFICIALS

Gary Binger, Director of the Office of Community Development, City of Walnut Creek  
Vicci Rudin, Associate Planner, City of Saratoga  
Mark Riesenfeld, Principal Planner, Marin County Planning Department  
June Baker, Housing and Community Development Coordinator, Marin County Planning Department  
Ann Draper, Housing Officer, Department of Community Development, City of Sunnyvale  
Garry Patton, Planner, Oakland City Planning Department

#### NON-PROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

Thomas LaFleur, Housing Director, Pittsburg Economic and Housing Development Corporation  
Rick Holliday, Executive Director, Eden Housing Inc., Hayward  
Wilburt Lee, Member, Board of Directors, Oakland Better Housing, Inc.

#### BUILDERS/DEVELOPERS

Joseph Melchoir, President, Building Industry Association of Northern California, Dublin  
William Leonard, Vice President, Future Planning and Growth, Hoffman Company - Builder/Developers, Concord

### LEGAL AID SOCIETIES

Russ McCubbin, Housing Planner, Marin County Legal Aid Society

### COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION LEADERS

Lilly Mae Jones, President, Coronado Neighborhood Council of  
Richmond, California

Hellen Plummer, Vice President, Coronado Neighborhood Council

### STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Edmund Tworuk, Program Manager, Surplus Lands Study, California  
State Department of Housing and Community Development

### STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Larry Ritter, Right of Way Agent, District 4

Lois R. Kirkendall, Right of Way Agent, District 4

Barbara J. Webb, Right of Way Agent, District 4





U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124900609